National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XV. NO. 25. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1854. WHOLE NO. 753.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY (ON SATURDAY),
At $3 per annum,
BY THE
AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
At its Office, 138 *Nassau St., New York,*
AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE
PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,
31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Pro-Slavery.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOUTHERN AID SOCIETY.

[From The New York Observer.]

THE Southern Aid Society held its first Anniversary on Wednesday evening, Oct. 26th, in the Mercer street Presbyterian church * * * *

The Report of the Executive Committee was read by Dr. Stiles, the General Agent of the Society. Of this interesting paper, we present a comprehensive abstract.

ABSTRACT OF REPORT.

"I. Within the limits of the United States, religious destitution lies comparatively at the South and South-west. From the first settlement of the country, the North has preserved a decided religious superiority over the South, especially in three important particulars—in ample supply of Christian institutions, extensive acquaintance with Christian truth, and thorough Christian regimen both in the church and in the community. While the Southern and South-western States have always *needed* a *stronger* arm of the Christian Ministry to raise them toward a Christian equality with their Northern brethren, their supply in this respect has always been decidedly *inferior*. The population of the North is near 13,000,000; the population of the South near 9,000,000. In the six following denominations, Baptist, Methodist, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Reformed Dutch, the Ministry of the North number about 14,000—at the South, 7,225. There is at the North something like one minister to every 900 souls—at the South, one minister to every 1,300 souls.

"II. The Missionary resources of the country God has located largely at the North. There are now 1,628 candidates for the ministry at the North, and only 487 at the South. Similar is the disproportion between the two sections of the Union in ability to educate men for the holy office, especially in the number and endowment of Theological Seminaries.

Equally distinguished is the North in her *pecuniary* resources for Home Missionary work. If the wealth of the Church may be judged either by the amount of her invested property or annual collections, the Church at the North, in proportion to her membership, possesses more than twice as much of the property of the North as the Church at the South possesses of the property of the South. The vested property of the six prominent denominations at the North is something like $45,400,000; at the South, $14,500,000. Of Northern property, one dollar of every $91 belongs to the Church by investment. Of Southern property, one dollar of every $205 belongs to the Church in the same way. The sum total of Home Missionary collections by the aforesaid denominations at the North is $453,640—at the South, $143,899. The annual excess of collections for domestic missions at the North above those at the South is more than $300,000.

"III. The Home Missionary power of our country is expended very freely upon the North—very sparsely upon the South.

"The six denominations annually send out into the waste places of the nation near 2,993 missionaries. Of this number, 2,402 labour in the destitutions of the North, and 591 amid the larger destitutions of the South.

"These denominations annually expend upon our national missions something like $540,498. Of this sum, $418,000 is disbursed at the *North*, and $132,000 at the *South*.

"With all her missionary power, what does the *North* do for the *South*? There are annually commissioned at the North 2,549 missionaries. Of these, 2,402 are employed at the North and North-west, and 57 sent to labour in the South and South-west. There are annually expended by that portion of the six denominations who reside at the North about $418,000. Of this sum, if we mistake not, more than $400,000 are spent in repairing the desolations of the North, while $10,000 is more than we can find annually expended upon the wastes of the South.

"IV. Does Christian wisdom, or Christian kindness, suggest an adequate reason for this our almost entire oversight of the Missionary claims of the South?

"We of the North-east annually send out thousands of missionaries, and hundreds of thousands of dollars, mainly to assist our struggling countrymen at the West; and this is all well. They are our neighbours, fellow-citizens, brethren in necessity. Had we doubled our annual supply, it would neither have surpassed their necessities nor our abilities. Say now! If we can do so much for the West, shall we do nothing for the South?

"Here now is our appeal to the public. If destitution lies at the South—if missionary power dwells at the North—and if good reason can be assigned for so largely confining our missionary supplies to the national destitutions of this latitude, we must find an agent to collect and convey our supplies to the South.

"Of one thing we would respectfully venture to express our conviction. No one of the pre-existing organizations will ever adequately do this work. We cheerfully accord to all, that they have done and are doing a noble service; and just where they work, have more to do than they can perform. But in reference to the adequate supply of Southern destitutions, *they have not done it.* If, therefore, anything is accomplished by the North for Home Missions and the South, we must set up a new medium of operation.

"V. What is the new structure set up to accomplish this important end? Three words describe the Southern Aid Society: In its spirit, it is rather *national* than *sectional*; in its dispensation, it is rather *evangelical* than *denominational*; in its method of action, it is rather *confiding* than *directory*.

"In regard to the latter it may not be necessary to explain that we do not ordinarily decide the common questions presented to a Missionary Board. We confide in the judgment of our Southern Brethren, as to the *men* most competent to serve God in their field, as to the most judicious *location* of the Missionary, and as to the special *directions* to be given him in preaching the Gospel. They are on the ground, and have grown up upon it. They know both the country and the people better than we do. We have therefore recorded it in our Constitution, that 'The object of the Society shall be the diffusion of Gospel truth in the Southern and South-western States; and in all ordinary cases this shall be done under the *direction* of ecclesiastical bodies, or missionary organizations of an evangelical character, within said States.'

"VI. Touching the manner in which this new agent has entered upon its work, we have but little to say.

"Both the *commercial* and the *political* affairs of the country assumed a very peculiar aspect shortly after the formation of our institution. The state of the one was as peculiarly uninviting to the agent who sought benefactions from the benevolent for a *new* organization as that of the other was discouraging to him who sought those benefactions for the *South*. It was judged advisable, in these circumstances, not to press our application upon the public at present, but to await Providential changes. We are happy to feel, however, that the Society has received a more liberal expression of public sympathy than could have been reasonably anticipated in our circumstances. During the year, the friends of the enterprise have contributed in its behalf an aggregate of $5,969, of which $4,595 12 have been paid into the treasury. As far as our funds have been collected, they have been distributed in Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia and Texas, and amongst five denominations, viz.: the Presbyterian churches, New and Old School; German Reformed, Congregational and Methodist. We believe that the moneys have been judiciously distributed, and we know that they have been very pleasantly and gratefully acknowledged."

When the reading of the report was concluded, Rev. Dr. Hutton presented the following resolution:

"Resolved, That, whereas, God has evidently raised up this nation to exert a strong evangelical influence upon the world, therefore we owe it to God and to man, to do all in our power to supply its destitutions with the preached Gospel."

Rev. Dr. Newton, of Jackson, Miss., seconded the resolution, and made an address upon the general subject of the destitution of the South. He said that the earnest labourers in the cause of Christ in that section of the country had, in times past, become almost discouraged by Northern persecution; but he had come to express their hearty regards for, and tell of their increased hopes on account of, the establishment of this Society. He asked, Why should not the North and the South labour together in the Lord's vineyard? The Gospel of Jesus Christ should not be bounded by State lines, or circumscribed by national prejudices. He alluded to the scarcity of ministers at the South, and the comparative supply at the North, though he said there was no want of church buildings there—but they were, in hundreds of instances, unsupplied by preachers. In the Southern States, there is a church to every 527 of the population, but the destitution of ministers is very great. We are famous, he remarked, for building meeting-houses. Every neighbourhood must have one, and any neighbour refusing to contribute his aid towards it would not be deemed respectable. * * * *

In the Northern States, there is a minister to every 728 people, but in the Southern to every 1,128; which is a disproportion of one-third against the South. In Virginia, there are 1,087 ministers of all denominations; while the number of churches is 2,383. In North Carolina, there are 1,795 churches and only 747 ministers; in Georgia, 1,682 churches, 715 ministers; in Mississippi, 1,016 churches, 471 ministers; while, on the other hand, in *New York*, the number of churches is 4,134, and of ministers 5,290—more preachers than churches. These statistics embrace the churches and ministers of *all* denominations; and, from the facts they state, it is shown that *three-fourths of all the Southern churches are, all the time, as silent as the grave itself!*

In all the slaveholding States, we have just 192 New School Presbyterian Ministers; that is, *one* minister to every 50,000 souls. It is true the Old School are more numerous; in many whole States, as South Carolina, Florida, Arkansas, and Louisiana, there is not a solitary New School minister. In Texas, there are 38 Old School and only 5 or 6 New School ministers, and they are so widely separated that they are not near enough even for mutual counsel or comfort.

Dr. Newton said he believed the thought from which originated the Southern Aid Society was heaven-inspired; and he was certain that no field ever promised a more abundant harvest than that of its operations. Moreover, the ministers at the South are well-treated, though Northern people suppose the contrary. They are seldom charged fare on public conveyances, and rarely ever at inns and hotels. There is a strong feeling prevalent among all the Southern people against doing so. Nor is there any obstacle there to the preaching of the Gospel which cannot be easily overcome; no clubs or societies, of infidel tendencies, to oppose it by powerful organization; no mad philosophers to distract the minds of the people; no Unitarianism, no Universalism, no Millerism, no Spiritualism, no Mormonism, no Swedenborgianism. The Southern heart is soft. Its enmity to God, though real and universal, is yet not direct and personal; but consists chiefly in a friendship to the world, and an over-careless neglect of the soul. Everybody in the South expects to join the Church some day or another,

What is wanted, then, is the *living preacher*, a band of self-denying workmen who are not ashamed of the Gospel, and are not afraid to declare it, as did the Apostles, who were determined to know nothing save Jesus Christ and him crucified. But it may be asked, Can such ministers safely go South? *Why not?* I know of no community in the South where the whole Bible may not be safely read, and the whole Gospel preached to masters and servants, and to parents and children. I know of no duty enjoined by the Scriptures that may not be explained and enforced by ministers at the South as well as at the North, or elsewhere. Is it supposed that the ministers, who are there and preach, withhold any portion of God's Word? We are *not* of those who keep back any of its doctrine.

The South is a great field, though the labourers are very few; but a new hope sprang up in the hearts of all when it was known that there was an organization called the Southern Aid Society, whose noble endeavours were to be directed towards supplying the destitution of a great section of the country.

The resolution which was seconded by Rev. Dr. Newton was then adopted, and the following was offered, upon which Dr. Bethune made a brief address:

"Resolved, That every tie of country and of Christianity—that all the memories of the past, and anticipations of the future—nay, that every obligation which God has imposed upon man in the second table of the law, summon us to cherish the very kindest regard toward our Southern brethren, and to coöperate with them heartily in efforts to build up the Kingdom within their bounds."

Dr. Bethune spoke of his detestation of the system of slavery, saying that he never had made an apology, and never would plead an excuse, for it. Yet, though he abhorred slavery, he knew no reason why he should not love the slaveholder. Moreover, he alluded to the South being under peculiar temptation to do wrong in this regard, and said that their errors should be more leniently regarded on that account. But whether they were right or wrong, the Gospel should be preached to them—in obedience to the mandate, "Preach the Gospel to *every creature*." He said, in allusion to the harsh words that have been spoken of the South by the North, that he believed the churches would be scourged by God for losing time and influence in collateral issues, into which so many had gone. The object of the Christian should be to obey his Master. The question should not arise between one man and another, What do you think is right? but all should show obedience to the Gospel, which enjoins, "Not my will, but thine, be done."

Rev. Dr. Samuel H. Cox then arose to address the audience; but, it being 10 o'clock, he said he would not inflict upon them a long speech. He alluded to the late action of the American Board at Hartford, and said that many things were done there which he could not approve. He thought too much malignity was manifested against the South, and related an incident of a private character that occurred, which deeply grieved him. On Thursday night, he said, when the debate was going on, he determined to go and vote; and while he was making his way through the numbers of people in the house, he met a reverend gentleman, to whom he courteously spoke and extended his hand. The only words spoken in reply were these in irony: "Dr. Cox, go on; they want you on the platform; there is a pro-slavery man speaking, and you may assist him." The gentleman speaking was Chancellor Walworth, who had been preceded by Hon. Theodore Frelinghuysen. Dr. Cox remarked that these gentlemen were good company for him to keep. He went on to say that he was *not* a pro-slavery man, and yet he sympathized with the Southern Aid Society.

A business meeting of the Society followed, at which another resolution was offered, and unanimously adopted:

"Resolved, That whereas, no violence of political animosity, no abhorrence of the institutions of slavery, no imaginable combination of powerful objections, could possibly exonerate us from the obligation to send the Gospel to Southern Territories, had they never constituted a part of this nation; therefore, the fact that the Southern States are, and ever have been, an integral portion of our common country does not absolve us from this solemn duty.

"Whereas, It is the preëminent glory of Christianity to rise above all prejudice and animosity, and love all men; whereas, it is the preëminent duty of the Christian to overcome all manner of opposition and convey the Gospel to the destitute; therefore, resolved, that while no political, no religious consideration whatever should influence us to withhold our reasonable sympathy and coöperation with Southern Christians in giving the Gospel to the needy, everything which makes up the spirit and the practice of Christianity should nerve us to set aside the temptation of the day and stretch out a noble Christian hand to the South."

Selections.

IT WILL END IN THE RIGHT.

NEVER despair! O, my Brother in sorrow!
I know that our mourning is ended not. Yet
Shall the vanquisht to-day be the victors to-morrow;
Our Star shall shine on when the Tyrant's sun 's set.
Hold on! tho' they spurn thee, for whom thou art living
A life only cheer'd by the lamp of its love:
Hold on—still hold on—in the world's despite,
Nurse the faith in thy heart, keep the Lamp of God bright,
And, my life for thine! it shall end in the Right.

What though the Martyrs and Prophets have perisht?
The Angel of Life rolls the stone from their graves;
Immortal 's the love and the freedom they cherisht,
Their Faith's triumph-cry stirs the spirits of slaves!
They are gone, but a glory is left in our life,
Like the day-god's last kiss on the darkness of even—
Gone down on the desolate seas of their strife,
To climb as star-beams up Liberty's heaven.
Hold on—still hold on—in the world's despite,
Nurse the faith in thy heart, keep the lamp of God bright,
And, my life for thine! it shall end in the Right.

Think of the wrongs that have ground us for ages!
Think of the wrongs we have still to endure!
Think of our blood red on history's pages!
Then work that our reck'ning be speedy and sure.
Slaves! cry unto God! but be our God reveal'd
In our lives, in our works, in our warfare for man;
And bearing—or borne upon—Victory's shield,
Let us fight battle-harnessed, and fall in the van.
Hold on—still hold on—in the world's despite,
Nurse the faith in thy heart, keep the lamp of God bright,
And, my life for thine! it shall end in the Right!

—*Poems and Ballads, by Gerald Massey.*

SENATOR SUMNER ON "PASSIVE OBEDIENCE" AND THE "HIGHER LAW."

[From The National Intelligencer, October 30.]

BOSTON, October 22, 1854.

To the Editors of the National Intelligencer.

GENTLEMEN: You have done me the honour to make certain remarks of mine, in a recent speech to my constituents at Worcester, the occasion of two elaborate articles, the first of six columns, and the second, coming forth after a week's rest, of three columns more. In the course of these articles, while quoting to excess from others, you give only detached bits, and in one case a garbled sentence, from the speech on which you undertake to sit in judgment, though all that I said on the point in question is embraced in a single column. As, from time to time, you have freely published communications from those who vindicate slavery as a national institution, I trust that one who holds the opposite opinion—regarding it as in every respect sectional, and in no respect national, as always and everywhere the creature and dependent of the States, and never anywhere the creature and dependent of the nation—may ask the simple justice at your hands of inserting in your paper, at an early day, the precise remarks which have been the subject of your strictures.

And pardon me, gentlemen, if I add a brief response to certain points in your extended lucubrations. Of course I have no desire to follow you in stirring anew the controversy of the bank; let the dead past bury its dead; but I wish to say a plain word in vindication of that constitutional principle which opened the bank, although sanctioned by the Supreme Court, by the judgment of Congress and the President, and which, as an essential element of our jurisprudence, is worth more than the bank itself, even in the imagination of its wildest partisans. That principle, now violently assailed by you, was enunciated by President Jackson, in a formal message to Congress, as follows:

"Each public officer who takes an oath to support the Constitution swears that he will support it as he understands it, and not as it is understood by others."

In your attack on this principle, you seek, in the first place, to deprive it of all authority as a rule of interpretation. And here you say:

"Flashing forth suddenly and unexpectedly, it dazzled for a moment the vision of superficial observers, but produced no lasting impression, and still less anything like conviction, upon intelligent and unprejudiced minds. The Senator from Massachusetts, so far as our memory serves us, is the only public man that has ever relied upon this now almost forgotten dogma of our great Warrior-President as a rule of conduct for himself."

And you say this with the very words of John Quincy Adams, quoted by myself, actually before you, declaring, in the last year of his life, that "the best thing ever uttered by Andrew Jackson was that for which he was so much abused; namely, that in swearing to support the Constitution, he swore to support it as he understood it, and not as other men understood it."

You say this, gentlemen, in the face of one of your own articles, where you characterize the message of President Jackson not as his message, but as the message of "the President's advisers," among whom you will remember was that unsurpassed jurist, Edward Livingston, then Secretary of State; that honourable statesman, Louis McLane, then Secretary of the Treasury; that favourite, at that time, of all parties, Lewis Cass, then Secretary of War; that laborious public servant, Levi Woodbury, then Secretary of the Navy; and that still living exemplar of careful learning and wisdom, Roger B. Taney, then Attorney-General, and now Chief Justice of the United States. Such were the "advisers" from whom, according to your own allegation, President Jackson's message proceeded; and yet, to sustain an assault on me, it is convenient to forget the great authority of these names, backed by John Quincy Adams: for I will not suppose that you hoped to avoid all this authority by the equivocal language which you employed.

Having satisfied yourselves by presenting the rule, despoiled of all authority in its support except that of the Warrior-President, you then proceed, with a looseness of diction which harmonizes with your argument, to assail it on grounds of reason. And here permit me to say that the prudence which has given to the journal over which you so honourably preside much of its character would, if not for a moment suspended, make you hesitate to charge any rule, upheld by the names I have mentioned, with the injurious consequences which, in your inflamed vision, seem to flow from this. You represent it as opening the floodgates of confusion and disorder. Here is a great mistake. But let me not occupy time on this point; I will merely refer to the speech which you assault. I do not venture to say that its argument cannot be answered, though I do not think that it can; but I do say confidently that you have not answered it.

But I stop here to touch one point which is not noticed in the speech. You quote the words of the Constitution, that "the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made," and you then tumble at once upon the conclusion that the interpretation of the Constitution which may be incident to the trial of these "cases" is final. Of course the judgment in the case actually pending is final, as the settlement of a controversy for weal or woe to the litigating parties; but as a precedent it is not final even on the Supreme Court itself. When cited afterwards, it will be regarded with respect as an interpretation of the Constitution, and, if nothing appears against it, of controlling authority; but at any day, in any litigation, at the trial of any "case," it will be within the unquestionable competency of the Court to review its own decision, so far as it establishes any interpretation of the Constitution.

And if this power is accorded to the Court literally, within its own sphere, to bind and unbind the text of the Constitution according to its judgment, with what face can it be denied to the coördinate branches of the Government who are respectively under oath to support the Constitution, and who, like the Court itself, may be called, within their respective spheres, incidentally to interpret the Constitution? In both instances, the power to interpret the Constitution is incident to other principal duties, as the trial of cases or the making of laws; and it seems as plainly incident to a "case" of legislation as to one of the "cases" of litigation.

But I leave this topic, and also the rhetorical appeals which you address to the people of Massachusetts in behalf of tyrannical laws, forgetful that among their best titles to respect is the resistance which they organised against the Stamp act and Tea tax, though sanctioned by acts of Parliament and by Judges, even as the Fugitive Slave bill in our day.

Jumping next from the rule of President Jackson, as adopted by me, which you will see is applicable only to those who have taken an official oath to support the Constitution, and not to private citizens, you swiftly arraign me again because I repudiate the doctrine of passive obedience to tyrannical power, in whatever form it may assume, and assert for every citizen, whether in public or private station, the supremacy of conscience as the final arbiter of all duty, to the extent of braving the penalties of an unjust law rather than obeying it. In conducting this arraignment, you are pleased to quote a fraction of a sentence in my speech, as follows: "The whole dogma of passive obedience must be rejected, whatever guise it may assume and under whatever alias it may skulk, whether in the tyrannical usurpations of King, Parliament or Judge."

And then you bravely exclaim: "Indeed! Does this Senator of the United States thus openly maintain that there is to be no obedience to the laws?" No such thing; and you, gentlemen, though you unfairly maimed the very sentence which you pretend to quote, must admit that it contains no such absurdity. Mark my words. It is only the tyrannical usurpations of the King, Parliament and judicial power which must be resisted (of course under all the personal perils and responsibilities incident to such resistance); and I proceeded to say, in the very sentence from which you have wrested your quotation, "whether in the exploded theories of Sir Robert Filmer, or the rampant assumptions of the partisans of the Fugitive Slave bill"; thus showing that I claimed no such general exemption from law as you attribute to me.

But, with marvellous inconsistency, while condemning my moderate doctrine, you actually quote and adopt the following language from Mr. Webster: "He (the President) may refuse to obey the law and so may a private citizen; but both do it at their peril." Of course they do. And again, on a late occasion, you quoted, with high commendation, a recent charge to the Grand Jury by a distinguished Judge of Massachusetts (Hon. E. Rockwood Hoar), which contains the following explicit passage:

"It has been said sometimes and in some places that there are laws which it is the duty of citizens to disobey or resist. I have no doubt, gentlemen, and I suppose none of you have any doubt, that a law may be enacted by a republican government, as well as an order passed by a despot, which may be in itself wicked; and if a statute is passed which any citizen, examining his duty by the best light God has given him, and acting conscientiously and uprightly, believes to be wicked, and which, acting under the law of God, he thinks he ought to disobey, unquestionably he ought to disobey that statute, because he ought to 'obey God rather than man.' I suppose that any man who would seriously deny that there is any thing higher than human law must ultimately deny even the existence of the Most High.

"But, gentlemen, it is not a question of private conscience which determines our duties in the premises. A man whose private conscience leads him to disobey a law recognised by the community must take the consequences of that disobedience. It is a matter solely between him and his Maker. He should take good care that he is not mistaken, that his private opinion does not result from passion or prejudice; but, if he believes it to be his duty to disobey, he must be prepared to abide by the result, and the laws, as they are enacted and settled by the constituted authorities, to be constitutional and valid, must be enforced, although it may be to his grievous harm."

I presume that you will not deliberately question the principle which is thus enunciated by Mr. Webster and by Judge Hoar. But this principle is identical with that which you so warmly condemn when put forth by me. The very speech which you undertake to criticise, and which was before you when you wrote, contains these words:

"The judgments of courts are of binding authority upon inferior tribunals and executive functionaries, whose virtue does not prompt them to resign office rather than aid in the execution of an unjust law. Over all citizens, whether in public or private station, they will naturally exert, as precedents, a commanding influence. This I admit; but no man, who is not lost to self-respect and ready to abandon that manhood which is shown in the heaven-directed countenance, will voluntarily aid in enforcing a judgment which, in his conscience, he solemnly believes to be against the fundamental law, whether of the Constitution or of God. Not lightly, not rashly, will he take the grave responsibility of open dissent; but, if the occasion requires, he will not hesitate. Pains and penalties may be endured, but wrong must not be done. 'I cannot obey, but I can suffer,' was the exclamation of the author of Pilgrim's Progress, when imprisoned for disobedience to an earthly statute. Better suffer injustice than do it. Better be even the poor slave, returned to bondage, than the unhappy commissioner."

And in another speech, made by me in the Senate and reported in the *Congressional Globe*, the supremacy of conscience is more fully vindicated and defined:

"As the throne of God is above every earthly throne, so are His laws and statutes above all the laws and statutes of man. To question these is to question God himself. But to assume that human laws are beyond question is to claim for their fallible authors infallibility. To assume that they are always in conformity with those of God is presumptuously and impiously to exalt man to an equality with God. Clearly human laws are not always in such conformity; nor can they ever be beyond question from each individual. Where the conflict is open, as if Congress should command the perpetration of murder, the office of conscience as final arbiter is undisputed. But in every conflict, the same queenly office is hers. By no earthly power can she be dethroned. Each person, after anxious examination, without haste, without passion, solemnly for himself must decide this great controversy. Any other rule attributes infallibility to human laws, places them beyond question, and degrades all men to an unthinking passive obedience.

"According to St. Augustine, an unjust law does not appear to be a law—*lex esse non videtur quæ justa non fuerit*; and the great fathers of the Church, while adopting these words, declare openly that unjust laws are not binding. Sometimes they are called 'abuses,' and not laws; sometimes 'violences,' and not laws. And here again the conscience of each person is the final arbiter. But this lofty principle is not confined to the Church. A master of philosophy in early Europe, a name of intellectual renown, the eloquent Abelard, in Latin verses addressed to his son, has clearly expressed the universal injunction:

"'Jussa potestasis terrenæ discutienda
Cœlestis tibi mox perficienda scias
Siquis divinis jubeat contrario jussis
Te contra Dominum pactio nulla trahat.'

The mandates of an earthly power are to be discussed: those of Heaven must at once be performed; nor can any agreement constrain us against God. Such is the rule of morals. Such, also, by the lips of judges and sages, has been the proud declaration of the English law, whence our own is derived. In this conviction patriots have fearlessly braved unjust commands and martyrs have died.

"And now, sir, the rule is commended to us. The good citizen, as he thinks of the shivering fugitive, guilty of no crime, pursued, hunted down like a beast, while praying for Christian help and deliverance, and as he reads the requirements of this act, is filled with horror. Here is a despotic mandate, 'to aid and assist in the prompt and efficient execution of this law.' Again let me speak frankly. Not rashly would I set myself against any provision of law. This grave responsibility I would not lightly assume. But here the path of duty is clear. By the supreme law, which commands me to do no injustice; by the comprehensive Christian law of brotherhood, by the Constitution which I have sworn to support, I am bound to disobey this act. Never, in any capacity, can I render voluntary aid in its execution. Pains and penalties I will endure, but this great wrong I will not do."

I have too often observed that all who undertake to uphold slavery, or that false interpretation of the Constitution by which its asserted rights are maintained, seem unconsciously to fall into a denial of the plainest principles of morals and the grandest truths of freedom; but I believe that you will not now venture to call me to order for anything said in vindication of the supremacy of conscience. An illustration will bring home to your convictions the absurdity of any position different from mine. If, for instance, Congress should decree the enslavement and sale of the honourable editors of the *National Intelligencer*, and a Judge should be found audaciously to declare the act constitutional, I do not doubt that you would denounce the whole proceedings, even though sanctioned by Congress and Judge, as a *tyrannical usurpation*, which good citizens, at every personal hazard, must refuse to obey. But there are many who, in their consciences, regard any legislation of Congress, though sanctioned by Judges innumerable, under which a fellow-man is reduced to slavery, as a *tyrannical usurpation*, hardly less flagrant than that which I have supposed, which good citizens, at every personal hazard, must refuse to obey.

I have the honour to be, gentlemen, your faithful servant, CHARLES SUMNER.

EMANCIPATION AND ITS RESULTS.

Correspondence of The Tribune.

ST. THOMAS, W. I., Sept. 9, 1854.

THE Danish Colonial authorities are at present dispensing to the former proprietors of slaves "compensation" for the losses they allege to have sustained by the act of the Government emancipating the same in 1848. The claim of compensation has been urged upon the home government at different times and in various ways since, and now, after the lapse of six years, what is deemed but partial remuneration is granted. But before proceeding to consider the terms of compensation, I propose to glance at the causes, obvious, probable and suspected, which led to emancipation in these islands, and also sketch briefly the history of that event.

Undoubtedly the leading cause was British Emancipation in 1834. Up to that time the system of slavery continued in its greatest strength and prosperity. Although the Danish Government, as early as 1792, leading the way for all nations, had declared the slave trade unlawful, and in 1803 abolished it, as late even as 1837, and probably still later, slaves were introduced here secretly from the Coast of Africa, and from the neighbouring Island of Porto Rico. But from 1832 the slave interest and, it is but justice to add, as a consequence, the agricultural interest in these islands began to decline. The act of the British Government could not fail to exert a commanding moral influence throughout the civilized world. That the greatest commercial nation on the globe, in all its eras distinguished for its obstinate adhesion to an advantageous commercial policy, should, at the risk of ruin and desolation to some of her fairest colonies, have her conscience so far operated on, mainly by considerations of justice and philanthropy, as to strike the chains from 800,000 slaves, was a fact irresistibly to arrest the attention of both peoples and governments everywhere, and secure serious and profound consideration upon the unrighteousness and inhumanity of slavery. The discussions, public and private, which led to that act constituted an evangel of emancipation to all nations. Its consummation encouraged and multiplied the friends of the slave in all lands. Other nations having slave colonies in these seas, and especially smaller and weaker governments, could not fail to perceive that the total abolition of slavery throughout the West Indies would prove the logical consequence of this step by Great Britain. The work was now begun; and that initiation was but the beginning of the end. Emancipation would henceforth be an open question. Agitation would not cease, insurrection would occur, commercial influences would operate, until they would be drawn into the train of adopting in some form the policy which England had inaugurated.

The secret dispositions of monarchical governments are not wont to be betrayed by striking public acts. But the temper of the then existing Governments of Denmark was soon believed to be such as to excite the serious jealousy of the planters throughout the islands. It is but natural to suppose that Frederick VI., who, as early as 1792, had been the first to declare the slave trade unlawful, and who still sat upon the throne, should be inclined to follow the example of Great Britain. And it is well known that Christian VIII. and Caroline his queen, who soon acceded, desired and fully intended emancipation. That diplomatic influences were employed by England we cannot affirm. We only know that from the period of 1832 till the present moment it has been her laudable desire and incessant endeavour to bring about the universal abolition of African slavery. And we find it a fixed belief here that she discharged an important agency both with the home and colonial governments in securing the result here.

We now pass to consider the effect of British Emancipation in the colonies themselves, and the causes, by that act put in operation, which prepared the way for the final result. So efficiently had these wrought, that one not carefully tracing their silent operation, and looking only at the depressed condition of the estates, and the diminished value of slave labour and property in 1848, the era of emancipation, would incline to the opinion that that step had become a necessity in the nature of the system, and that slavery had expired by a natural death.

As we have already said, slavery still flourished here in 1832. But by giving freedom to 800,000 blacks, in islands scattered through these seas, and some of them but a few hours' sail, between which and the Danish islands there had always been frequent intercourse of free blacks, and of the slaves themselves, the system of slavery was here essentially disturbed. The wild delight with which nearly a million of slaves received their freedom proved infectious to these and other communities still held under the power of the taskmaster, and excited the hope and resolve eventually to enjoy the same boon. Freedom became a fixed idea in the minds of the slaves. Indefinite and insane anticipations of its benefits were cherished. Each successive year of prolonged bondage become more insupportable, and begot the heart sickness of hope deferred. The forced labour under which, in their ignorance of a better condition, they had tamely submitted became now irksome. The heart went not with the hand in love and its labour, or in devotion to the master. The mind became gradually enlightened as to the unrighteousness of the relation in which he was held, sacrificed to the interests and caprices of another, and the whole nature of the slave rebelled. The natural consequence was, that he no longer loved his master, but regarded him as his only enemy, as having an entirely hostile interest. He no longer willingly obeyed him, and only watched his opportunity to escape to some neighbouring island, where "slaves cannot breathe." Occasional escapes to Tortola taught the masters that their so-called property had the quality ascribed by inspiration to all "riches." The state of things became worse year by year. The slaves became more indolent, faithless, obstinate and cunning to vex and accomplish the ruin of the masters. Their labour ceased to be remunerative. Their cash value fell by one-half. The estates declined until the system became nearly as burdensome to the master as irksome and hated to the slaves.

From the moment British emancipation was accomplished, the owners of slaves in the islands felt that the system here was fated to fall. From that moment, distrust of the Home Government sprang up in their breasts, and the idea gained firm possession of them that the way was to be gradually prepared for such a consummation, and that the first favourable opportunity would be eagerly embraced. Acts of the local authorities confirmed this belief. Measures favourable to the slave were adopted, and the discipline of the master was no longer rigidly enforced, so that he soon found he would gain no assistance or sympathy from the Government, and that his wiser course was to get along the best way he could without appealing to or calling in the aid of the police, which had formerly been done. Christian VIII. and Caroline, who succeeded Frederick, made no secret of their wish to free the slaves. In consequence of this distrust, the planters justly felt that their property in slaves was altogether insecure. All motive hence to enlarge and improve their plantations and increase the number of their slaves was taken away. On the other hand, their endeavour was to contract all and prepare themselves for the inevitable change. Of course, a fatal palsy fell upon all plantation operations, under which the estates rapidly declined. Thus all causes conspired to render the planters not only acquiescent in whatever final measures the government should adopt, but to desire emancipation as a relief from some, at least, of the evils of their deplorable condition.

Such was the position of affairs in 1847, when a romantic incident in the domestic life of the King and Queen led to the adoption of a measure looking to the extinction of slavery in these their cherished colonies. Queen Caroline, who still survives as Queen-Mother, seems a very humane and benevolent woman, and, from the period of her sitting upon the throne, to have set her heart most earnestly upon the liberation of the slaves. Some years before, she had obtained from the King the pledge that on the twenty-fifth anniversary of their marriage he would give a striking testimonial of his affection by freeing the slaves in the West India possessions. Accordingly, on the 28th of July, 1847, the day to which she had long looked forward as to the accomplishment of a leading desire of her life, the King issued his rescript declaring absolute emancipation at the expiration of twelve years, and unconditional freedom to all children of slaves born from the present date. That period was given in order, as was supposed could be done, to enable the masters to remunerate themselves by the labour of the slaves in the interval for the loss of them; and also to bring their affairs into such a state that they could then continue the cultivation of their estates under a system of free labour. It was done only after consultation with the proprietors, and the formal expression of their opinion that such would be the wisest measure, and of their declared acquiescence in the same.

But the consummation of this measure was destined not to be so long delayed, and was hastened on the following year by a startling event in Europe—the French Revolution of February. That outbreak of Liberty, which rose upon the world like a water-spout out of a smooth sea, if it ended too soon, alas, in a more hopeless despotism in France, and retarded the era of European disenthralment, deserves the praise of having given freedom to the slaves in the French W. I. islands, and indirectly in the Danish islands. In Feb., 1848, the Provisional Government declared the abolition of slavery throughout the French islands; and in July following, the slaves here took the business into their own hands, plotted, and carried through a successful insurrection. Blacks from the French islands, who had so recently received their freedom, and who, it is also asserted, were freedmen of Christ Jesus of the Methodist persuasion, came down to these islands, particularly to St. Croix, proclaiming the Gospel of Emancipation, and exciting their brethren to insurrection.

That Governor-Gen. Von Scholten had an important agency in hastening emancipation, is generally believed and conceded. Still, various and even contradictory opinions as to the nature of said agency are entertained: I have therefore reserved to this place, notice of the same in the foregoing enumeration of causes. In the first place, as the opinions seem based very much on the mere suspicions and prejudices, excited by his conduct when the insurrection broke out; and, secondly, that I might therefore properly connect allusion to his supposed agency with the history of his acts. This man, whose memory is held in general execration in these colonies, and over whose recent death, in Denmark few were found to mourn, had long been a government official in the Colonial Government, having passed through various offices of trust and especially of *emolument*, to the post of Governor-General of the Islands, which he then held. He is represented as a man courting the favour of all, from the occupants of the throne and the ministers of his own and foreign courts to the meanest slaves; to have spent a vast deal of money, and to have needed more. At a period when the offices of government in these Islands were openly prostituted to the basest and most corrupt extortions, and hence to have been wont to replenish his purse by connivance at the grossest commercial frauds, at the African slave trade to this and the Spanish islands, and even by something more than complicity with piratical operations in these waters; and also, in order to secure money, to have condescended to walk arm in arm with moneyed negroes through the most frequented streets; while with equal success he could fawn in the presence of Ministers at the Court of St. James. Such are the suspicions and allegations which start up in this community at the name of Von Scholten. I give them for what they are worth as such.

At 8 o'clock on the evening of the 2d July, from the various estates of St. Croix the bells rang out the signal of insurrection. The inhabitants of Fredricksted and its vicinity, which town is situated at the west end of the island, were the first to take the alarm. The rising seems to have been plotted, and first manifested itself in that quarter. The people fled to the shipping harbour for security, yet no violence on the part of the slaves as yet manifested itself. A messenger was dispatched for the Governor-General at Christiansted, or East End. On the morning of the 2d, 2,000 slaves, armed with chance weapons, entered the town of Fredericksted, went to the fort, and demanded their freedom; but, being told that there was no one in authority to grant, and their number being swelled by an accession of 3,000 more from various parts of the island, they proceeded to various acts of violence, though altogether on public buildings and property. The whipping-post, doubtless a most hated institution, and of which it is likely many had harrowing recollections, was torn up and triumphantly thrown into the sea. During this day, the Governor-Gen. arrived, entered the fort, and soon, without the least effort to suppress the revolt, and even refusing to sanction measures for the same, by his order, unconditional freedom was proclaimed from the ramparts. In this part of the island, the blacks now retired to the estates, of which they held almost undisputed possession, most of the whites having fled to the town and harbour for security. Here they gave themselves up to a wild delight, which manifesting itself in bonfires, noisy revel and uproar, struck unnecessary terror into the minds of the whites, and excited the needless fear of general massacre. They, however, committed but few acts of violence, compared with what might naturally be expected from such a mass of ignorant beings having at length their former masters and oppressers in their power, both as to life and property. Those whites who remained on their estates experienced no violence; and it seems probable that had all likewise remained instead of abandoning their houses and property to the unrestrained power of the mob, the blacks, on obtaining their freedom, would have returned quietly to resume their labours.

At Christiansted, on the night of the 3d, a crowd of negroes from that part of the island attempted to enter the town, but were repulsed by the discharge of a small field-piece guarding the entrance, killing some and wounding others. The negroes now had possession of all the island except the towns. How to reduce them to order was now the question. The Government forces on shore and in the harbour, the militia and the citizens generally were ready to do their duty and march out and put them down. But the Governor-General refused to institute or sanction any steps of the kind. On the 6th, the troops from the towns, in opposition to the orders of the Gov.-General, marched out,

than they believed, some ninety years ago, in the binding force of the Stamp Act, or, a hundred years ago, in the rights of British naval officers to make a press in our streets. The privelege of Boston citizens to be free from such seizures was effectually vindicated in the year 1749 by a mob, whom the wealthier citizens, when they thought the town in danger of being bombarded by Commodore Knowles, stigmatized as "negroes and persons of vile condition," but whose violence, nevertheless, they had themselves encouraged and stimulated, as the most effectual way, as it proved to be, of meeting this press outrage, and of preventing its repetition.

So it was in the revolutionary times. Among those who fell in the famous Boston massacre of 1770 was one Attucks, a negro, but who had, with the other victims—though coloured children are not even now admitted to our public schools—a splendid public funeral, and whose death, with that of the others, was for years commemorated (notwithstanding the acquittal on the ground that they had acted *within the law* of the soldiers who had slain them), by annual orations from such men as Warren and Hancock. And he and they were thus honoured because they had braved all the terrors of the law, even when that law was backed by bullets and bayonets, in defence of the rights and liberties of Massachusetts.

As to Mr. Butman, he seems to have suffered very much the same treatment which happened to two military officers whom Gage had sent into the country, in disguise, to take observations, shortly before the battle of Lexington; and who scampered back to Boston somewhat damaged, and still more frightened, bringing very terrible accounts, as Butman does, of the insubordinate and rebellious spirit of the rash country people, and putting the Boston Tory presses of that day into great agitation.

Now, our United States officials may as well understand at once that, so far forth as relates to the enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Act, they now are looked upon here in Massachusetts very much in the same light in which Governor Gage and his tools, civil and military, were regarded in 1775. In Boston, they may be tolerably safe; but let them venture into the country on any such errand, or under suspicion of any such errand, at the peril of their skins; and let us tell them, too, that they are watched, and that it will not be possible for one of them, disguise himself as he will, to be for half an hour in the most remote and retired part of the State, before his incognito will fail him, and he will have at least a dozen *vigilant* observers at his heels, to watch his every step and action. As to such officers as were actively concerned in the kidnapping of Burns, they will not, if they take our advice, venture into the country at all. Their mere presence anywhere will arouse just suspicions, upon which action more prompt than agreeable to the parties suffering will be very apt to follow.

It is our old Massachusetts maxim to repel force by force, come from whatever quarter it may, and under whatever disguise of legal authority; and although our slave-catching officials may possibly maintain themselves here in Boston a little while longer, at least during the official terms of Messrs. Smith and Washburn, as Gage and his officials did all through the year 1775, even now it is not safe for them to venture into the country, nor can they look for impunity even in Governor Washburn's own city of Worcester.

The immediate provoker of this Worcester riot, and the man to whom Butman ought to look for the reparation of his damages, is, we take it, Mr. Benjamin F. Hallett, Mr. Pierce's slave-catching attorney for the district of Massachusetts. An attempt was made by this person to obtain, three months ago, from the then United States Grand Jury, bills of indictment against certain persons supposed to have been concerned in the attack upon the court-house with the view of rescuing Burns. But that Grand Jury, in the sound exercise of their legal discretion and rights—for to that end do Grand Juries exist—declined to find any bills. Perhaps they thought that as Massachusetts had already assumed jurisdiction of that affair, it was best to leave it in her hands. Perhaps they doubted the constitutionality of the slave act. Perhaps they were not satisfied with the evidence. At any rate, they ignored the bills; and here, in common cases the matter would have stopped. But Mr. Hallett is not a common case. A renegade Abolitionist turned slave-hunter must needs exhibit a little of the bloodhound. So he has his witnesses here at the present term of the Court, and sends Butman to Worcester for new ones, expecting, we suppose, to wheedle or bully the new Grand Jury into hunting in his pack. We doubt, however, if he will succeed much better than his compatriot Butman did. Mr. Hallett, we know, is tough and brazen; but the contemptuous glances of four and twenty grand jurymen, who know their rights as such, and who mean to maintain the rights of their fellow citizens, and their State, must be almost equivalent, spiritually considered, at least, to a pelting with rotten eggs, or even with paving stones.—*Boston Telegraph.*

PUBLIC SENTIMENT IN EUROPE CONCERNING THE UNITED STATES.

Correspondence of the N. Y. Times.

PARIS, Oct. 5, 1854.

* * * AFTER all that may be said about philanthropy, and consanguinity, and the ties of commerce, and the march of mind, and the diffusion of sentiments of peace, it is notorious that, in many things, nationally, politically and socially, we are a rock of offence to Europe; to the prevailing sentiment of the governments and people; and especially to those of England and France; and hence that feelings of disgust and hostility toward us are in the bosoms of the two Governments.

The opinion is no doubt very extensively held among the unreflecting portion of our people that we are great favourites everywhere; and the same class of persons have no doubt a settled conviction that we are in all things an overmatch for all creation. The prayer of the poet—

> Oh, would kind Heaven the giftie gie us
> To see ourselves as ithers see us—

would be a wiser exercise of thought and feeling. A few years since, there was, no doubt, especially among the masses of Europe, a very general sympathy with and for us and our institutions. But it is certainly otherwise now. There is, indeed, nothing of a political nature, on this side of the water, more remarkable than the change that has come over Europe, within the last two years, in respect to the United States. The facts on this point I will endeavour to indicate, and will also attempt to suggest the proper inferences.

* * * The disgraceful brawls in Congress; the fillibusterism which seems to taint the whole popular mind; the general feeling that we must take Cuba to save our "peculiar institutions"; the new doctrine that slavery is a blessing, and as such must be perpetuated; the removal, by an act of the national Legislature, of an ancient limit to the extension of slavery; the passages between Benton and Pettit; the decision in Kentucky that a gentleman may murder a schoolmaster and be acquitted by Judge and Jury; the appointment of such a creature as Borland as Foreign Minister, and the consequent destruction of Greytown; the demand of ten millions of dollars for fillibustering purposes by the President; the Irish and German riots; the drama of the negro Burns and the United States at Boston—these, and a multitude of minor incidents, including murders, slaughters by railroad and steamer, losses by fire and shipwreck, commercial panics, bank explosions, railroad robbing by Cranes and Schuylers—these are all made to pass and repass before the public eye, losing nothing of the sinister and revolting light they cast upon our country and our people, through the glaring malignity of editorial comments.

* * * * * *

Various other causes have contributed to make our country and our people unpopular with the masses of France. Among them, I may specially note our position in respect to slavery. *Uncle Tom* has been read by all classes; twenty editions are for sale at the bookstores. It has been dramatized, engraved, lithographed, versified and set to music; and thus wrought into the popular mind by every appliance of literature and art. In its nature, it is a work that appeals with intense sympathy to the humbler classes.

And, as if it were the design of our country to vindicate and enforce the terrible portraitures of this dark romance, the Administration, Congress, the slaveholding organs, have all, recently, set before the world a series of acts and declarations, making slavery appear to be a National Institution, cherished by the Government, and favoured by North and South, as a good and beneficent Institution—compatible with American liberty and with Christianity, and essential to their full development among us! I cannot better illustrate what I mean than by narrating an anecdote.

An American friend of mine was called upon, a few days since, for settlement of a bill by a Paris wine merchant, when the following conversation occurred:

Wine Merchant—What do the Americans think of the war?

American—They do not take a partisan interest in it.

Wine Merchant—And why not?

American—It seems to them only a struggle between the despotisms of Europe, in which the people have little interest, about which they were hardly consulted. When we see a struggle in which the masses of Europe are concerned, then we shall sympathize with them.

Wine Merchant (rising with great animation)—I pray you to excuse me; but this pretence on the part of Americans of sympathy for the masses seems to me an odious hypocrisy; for you hold three millions of the masses of mankind in slavery! You are the last people in the world who should come to Europe to talk of liberty, and to express sympathy for the oppressed masses. This is the high privilege only of men whose hands are pure.

American—But you must not charge slavery upon us as a national institution; it belongs only to certain States.

Wine Merchant—I am astonished to hear a man of your position make a statement so notoriously inexact. I have read the American papers, and I see that an act has recently been passed by your Congress, removing from certain territory an ancient barrier to the extension of slavery therein.

American—That was, however, rather a theoretical than a practical measure.

Wine Merchant—It strikes me as highly practical, because it was a measure avowedly gratifying to the slave interest. It was so intended by the President and the Administration; it was so received by the slaveholders; it was voted for by a majority of both Houses of Congress, Members from the Free States participating in the affirmative vote. Now, does not this show that slavery is a National and cherished institution among you?

American—It may wear that aspect here, where you have only a partial view of facts; but the men who brought forward the measure you allude to were only seeking private ends. It was, in short, a bid for the Presidency.

Wine Merchant—Yes; so I understood it. It was the move of politicians; but why did they thus pay court to slavery? Because of its power; they courted the slaveholders, because they are masters of the country, its opinions, policy, patronage. If it were, as you pretend, merely a local institution, you would not see President, Senators, a whole Congress, making court to it. No, Sir, it is clear that slavery is a national establishment in the United States, and is the great key to your policy, domestic as well as foreign. In your national elections, you must have a President and Vice-President favourable to slavery. It is to serve the cause of slavery that a spirit of lawlessness has been evoked, threatening Cuba, Mexico, and indeed the whole tropical portion of America.

American—You are drawing very large inferences from very small premises. What you say is true only in appearance and upon the surface. Slavery is not a cherished institution; it is tolerated only as a necessity. *It exists, and what shall we do with it?* No one has yet given a solution of this fact, or suggested a practical answer to this question. I repeat, it is *tolerated*, not cherished. We all hope it will be removed from the country within a reasonable term.

Wine Merchant—Here again, according to my point of view, you are stating, unconsciously of course, a series of inexactitudes. As a matter of rigid logic, I would undertake to prove every assertion you make as untrue, and every inference you draw as fallacious. Slavery is not merely tolerated in the United States, it is cherished; you neither hope nor believe in its abolition. I read, not long ago, a letter written by the American Minister at Stockholm (Mr. Bedinger), in which he positively declares that the opinion is fast becoming general in the United States that slavery is not only compatible with Christianity, liberty and the rights of man, as understood in the United States, but it is essential to their full development. I see this view maintained throughout the entire South, and the conduct of your Government and of your politicians is in harmony with it. * * * * *

Such was the substance of the dialogue; and though I do not mean to vindicate the statements or the logic of the Wine Merchant, yet it is indisputable that he stated truly the tendency of popular opinion in Europe, and especially in France, as to the position of the United States in regard to slavery. If there is one thing in which Europe is agreed, it is that Negro Slavery is an abomination before God and man. On your side of the water, where you are familiar with the views of slaveholders, you can hardly conceive of the horror with which their doctrines are regarded. To deny that the African is in all things a man, is not only against Cuvier, as the greatest of naturalists, but it is against what is universally acknowledged in society. Democracy, here, especially, calls all men brethren. One of the first acts of the late Provisional Government of France was to abolish slavery, and this was done in condescension to public opinion. There are 200 pupils of negro blood in the Colleges of Paris. Dumas, one of the most gifted men of the age, is part negro. You constantly see negroes, of various degrees of mixture, in society.

Now, for us to say to the people of France that these are not men, or that, if they are, they are an inferior race, and hence we may enslave them, is as shocking to the French popular mind as it would be to say that a Hindoo, a Jew or a Turk is not a man, and hence may be enslaved. This doctrine of the slaveholders seems here to involve the doctrine that might is right; in other words, it completely destroys the foundations of all morality. The great precept—Do unto others as you would have others do to you—is completely overturned by it. If the new doctrine is true, then our Declaration of Independence is a fallacy, Democracy and Christianity a farce.

Such are the reflections forced upon the mind here by the attitude we seem to be assuming. If things progress thus, we shall not long challenge the sympathy of the people of Europe as friends of liberty, friends of the oppressed; nay, rather the popular sentiment will rise in indignation against us, as a nation of oppressors, who add to tyranny the hypocritical pretence of democracy. The signs of these coming events seem already visible. A few days since, an American lady in Paris scolded her French cook. Said the servant, bitterly, "Do you think I am a negro?" An American, going to a railroad station, spoke sharply to the man who carried his trunk. The reply was, "Do you take me for a slave?"

Now, I am not telling things that are apochryphal—things that can be set aside by a sneer, or annihilated by a boast. I grasp in one view a map of things, notoriously true. And the general inference is obvious. We have already lost, or are fast losing, that honourable prestige that once belonged to our name. The opinion is getting to be general, among rulers and people, that we are an unscrupulous and an unprincipled nation, which it is impossible to love, and impossible not to fear or hate. Our prosperity only aggravates this general tendency to aversion.

Now, a man or a nation, armed in conscious truth, honour, and integrity, may set fear at defiance. But can we Americans afford to outrage the moral sense of Europe—the moral sense of its Governments and its people?

Americans believe that the masses of Europe are their friends! If my views be correct, they are fast becoming our enemies. What will soon be our situation, especially if we engage in some offensive act of aggression, like the seizure of Cuba? In that case, how shall we face France and England, armed, as they are likely to be, with the material power of Europe, and seconded by the feelings of both Governments and people throughout this quarter of the globe?

Even if we do not shrink from such consequences, through any apprehension of political evils, of so direct and serious a nature, are there not still other weighty reasons why we should endeavour to maintain a good name before the world? To a certain degree, to a very great degree indeed, the United States are charged with the duty of maintaining Republican institutions, and commending them to the good will of other nations. This is a high mission, and one which we often claim with no little exultation. How are we fulfilling this mission, in making ourselves an object of dislike, ridicule and fear, to high and low, rich and poor? How is the present Democratic Government of the United States discharging the duty of strengthening the hearts and hands of the friends of liberty in Europe?—By its subserviency to slavery, its degrading and disgraceful foreign appointments, its dastardly outrages upon defenceless towns, its attempts to promote schemes of foreign aggression by millions of money asked for by the President, its notorious prostitution to party, its use of Executive influence to break down one of our ancient landmarks of freedom, its course in general tending to destroy patriotism in the hearts of the people, to debase the standard of manners, and to degrade and debauch public and private morals!

All these things are charged by more than one party at home upon the present Administration. True or false, they are believed here, and the monitory finger of the Conservative is lifted, with the universal remark, "I told you so! Such is the inevitable tendency of republicanism!" And where are the republicans here that have the courage or power to rise up and gainsay such language? Let it be remembered that even the Democratic *Presse* of Paris has almost abandoned us of late, and that the republican *Siècle* does not pretend to defend many of our acts. To such a point we have actually sunk in public and even republican opinion.

If these are not sufficient arguments to rouse the people of the United States to a sense of the position of things, and of the necessity for a change, let me suggest that love of country itself depends to a certain degree upon our good name. It is with nations as with individuals, a good name is the greatest of treasures; without it, both one and the other are poor indeed. Material strength cannot exist without moral support. The force of a giant is spent when the heart fails. We have fertile lands, full garners and glittering mines. Above all, we have the vigour of youth, and are masters of a new world. How high, how fair is our seeming destiny! And yet, if wrong be with us and right against us, we shall be weak from the want of moral support, within and without. Let us go on as we have lately done, let us follow to the end the downward path in which our present rulers are conducting us, and we are lost, as well from the debasement of our institutions as from the general reprobation of mankind.

I cannot close this letter without adverting to one topic more—and that, in all respects, a painful and humiliating one. It is a general opinion upon this side of the water that our Union is destined, at no very distant day, to fall before the sectional divisions now seeming to rend the very bosom of society. The revival of the slavery agitation, it is believed, can only terminate in the separation of the North from the South. It is held by calm and reflecting lookers-on that the North will not much longer submit to have the policy of the General Government directed and controlled for the avowed and premeditated extension and perpetuation of slavery, and that without this the South will fly off from the compact.

This is not my theory; this is not my belief. To the hearts of the American people, to their political faith and historical associations, the Union is the very ark of the covenant of liberty. As such I trust it will be maintained. But the fact I state, that the Europeans would add to their general reprobation of some points in our character and history a distrust of the very foundation of our strength, and the only hope of our future prosperity, is a serious consideration, inasmuch as it deprives us of that respect and influence which is founded upon power. While our name is the United States, it is a tower of strength; when it becomes that of the Disunited States, it carries weakness and destruction with it.

DICK TINTO.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, NOV. 11, 1854.

WHAT THEY THINK OF US ABROAD.

IT is happy for mankind that there is no such thing as absolute invulnerability. Achilles could be pierced (and was) in the region of the tendon which bears his name. Orlando was accessible to Fate by the soles of his feet. The might of Sampson was shorn off together with his hair. Even the American People have their weak side. And it is their sensitive vanity as to the opinion the European world holds of them. Even the King of Dahomey, when he received Mungo Park (we believe it was he) in state, and in a state of nature, with a wife on either side feeding him with rice, even His Dahomean Majesty was curious to know what was thought of him in England? How much more natural is it for this Great Nation to wish to learn how it stands in the estimation of mankind? It is told by its domestic toadies that it is "the virtuousest, discreetest, best" of nations that are, or ever have been. But, then, it is satisfactory to know that this opinion is held by the rest of Christendom as well. The adulation or assentation of flatterers at home needs the endorsement or acceptance of foreign nations in order to make us quite sure that it is really sound and current—actually a "golden opinion," or readily convertible into such.

The *Daily Times* of this City, of the 27th *ultimo*, had a letter from its Parisian Correspondent which was greatly germane to this matter, and most of which we have copied elsewhere. We have heard that the writer is a gentleman of some literary repute at home, as the author of the Reveries of a Bachelor. However this may be, he is a clever man and a good writer of letters—and by no means a fanatical Abolitionist, but a cool, sensible observer, with his eyes open to see what is going on before them, and his mind prompt to draw its own deductions from them. In this letter he tells the American People, what the Abolitionists have been warning them of for years, that they are fast turning the public sentiment of Europe against them. The mere fact of the increasing knowledge of our institutions and national character, on the part of the European nations, would account for this fact, of itself. It is true, doubtless, that, in former years, the liberal party in England and on the continent did look with hope and favour to this country. But that was when they took us at our own account of ourselves, and supposed our Fourth of July *fanfaronades* were the veritable utterances of the national heart and mind. Closer connection with us has taught many, if not most, of them with how many bushels of allowance those rhetorical flourishes are to be taken. The change in European opinion about us is no new or sudden thing, but has been growing upon them with the better acquaintance of Europe with us. They have been finding out their mistake—that is all.

Still, it cannot be denied that we have been doing our best (or worst), of late months and years, to lower ourselves in the eyes of Europe and to bring ourselves down to our proper level. A character is a hard thing to maintain, we all know—provided it is not a real one. When Col. Chartres told Lord Chesterfield that he would give twenty thousand pounds for a good character, his lordship replied, "then it would be the worst bargain you ever made in your life—for you would lose it again in a week!" So we have shown a more than comfortable alacrity at sinking in the estimation of mankind. What few rags of reputation we had left we have made all convenient haste to fling away, to be trodden under foot of men. Not content with making Slavery an integral element of our institutions, we have insisted, of late years, on erecting it into the absorbing and paramount one. It has been made the main prop and stay of all the platforms of each of the two great National parties, and has been dovetailed in among the planks, at least, of the party that has claimed to be holier in this regard than they. We have elevated Slavecatching into a virtue, and proclaimed, by the mouth of our chiefest oracles, the duty of conquering our prejudices against its due exercise. And if we have not conquered our prejudices against it, we have at least let it have free course and be glorified, and turned out our make-believe soldiers in its honour and its help.

Then the open defence of Slavery, on its merits, not only by slaveholding politicians, but by eminent clergymen, and these not only of the Slave States, but of the North Country as well, Doctors of Divinity in Philadelphia and New York and Boston, Theological Professors and Presidents of Colleges—these things may not sound so strangely to us who are to the manner born and who have had the blessings of religious education. But to simple Catholics and Protestants of the Continent and of Great Britain they grate on their ears and are shocking to their moral sense as nothing short of blasphemous railing against God and Christianity. Then our removing of the ancient landmarks of Slavery, and opening countries nearly as extensive as the civilized portion of Europe to its incursions; our drinking-bouts and fisticuffs in Congress; our Fillibustering; our Greytown glories; the blackguards we have sent to represent us at their Courts (and can we complain if they judge us by the sample we have furnished ourselves?), and the insults we have seemed to wish to imply in some of the most important of these appointments; not to mention our repudiations, Schuylerisms and Crane-ologies; all these things are as well known, and perhaps better understood, abroad than at home. Of course, it is for the interest of the powers that be in Europe that Republican Institutions should be odious in the eyes of the people, and all they have to do is to let the plain truth be told about us, and they will be odious enough. It seems to have been the mission of our Government, in its Legislative, Executive and Diplomatic capacities, to make Republicanism at once despicable and detestable.

Uncle Tom's Cabin, undoubtedly, has had much to do with this modelling of European opinion about us. It brought the horrible facts of Slavery home to every fireside, whether of palace or of hovel, of all Europe. But we apprehend *Uncle Sam's Cabinet* would not have been long in effecting the same results. The *Times* Correspondent represents the feeling of contempt and hatred which is felt by Europe for America as unequivocal and increasing. We do not doubt the truth of what he says, because it is a philosophical necessity that it should be so. Our main hold on European sympathies was through the Liberals, or Revolutionary party, who, in the days of their ignorance, thought that we were indeed in earnest in our denunciations of all despotisms and our shoutings for liberty everywhere. Such inspired simpletons as M. Kossuth there were, whom no amount of genius or of suffering could teach that braggarts could be liars. But even the magic of his honeyed accents could conjure a nest of slaveholders into a Power on Earth. Liberalism, generally, has opened its eyes to the true character of our Love of Liberty, even if the great Magyar has not yet recovered from his judicial blindness. Mazzini has made his opinions clear, and even Smith O'Brien has rebuked the swiftness of Citizen Mitchel's Americanism. All the sympathies of the Governing element of the country are one with the European despotism. Napoleon is more the American hero than Washington, and his Brummagem imitation has no sincerer admirers than among the Americans. If the next news should be (as it well may) that the Allied Armies have been compelled to surrender at discretion to Menchikoff, there will be no sincerer rejoicings at St. Petersburgh than at Washington and Charleston. The Liberals of Europe are learning these things, and add their contempt to the hatred their tyrants feel for us.

No one can more deeply regret the cause of this state of feeling towards our country than we do. But we do not regret that the cause produces its legitimate effects. It is a natural and wholesome state of things, and nothing but good can come of it. The good may come in the shape of evil; but it is better that it should come in any shape than not at all. As matters now stand, the American nation blocks the way of all the progressions of the world. Its nationality had better be blotted out forever from the record of Nations than that it should be the curse that it now is to its inhabitants and to the world. And if this should be done by the united force of the European nations, banded together in a new Crusade against real Slavery and sham Republicanism, posterity would not fail to see in it the same guiding hand that has directed the destinies of mankind in all times. Repentance might avert the doom which, in some shape, must overtake a nation so wicked as this. But we fear that it is joined to its idols, and is only spared for heavier judgments. The Public Sentiment of Europe is the Contemporary Prophecy at once and History of this Trans-Atlantic Posterity of theirs. It would be well for us if we gave ear to it.

CLERICAL INFLUENCE.....NO. II.

THE charge made by Abolitionists, that the Church is the bulwark of slavery, and that the clergy are responsible for its continuance and increase, is met with denial by the persons accused, and with doubt by the majority of men. They allege that the clergy have not influence enough to accomplish so vast an object, and point, with some plausibility, to the meagerness of their churches compared with their congregations, implying that those who withstand their pastor's influence in its main purpose will not be likely to yield to it in a secondary and incidental matter; an implication which might have much force but for the fact that it is easier to lead men in the direction of their wishes than in opposition to them.

We shall be better prepared to understand the mode in which clerical influence ordinarily acts to sustain slavery (advocates of it so direct and thorough-going as President Lord are exceptional cases) by glancing a moment at the ordinary operation of that influence in the minister's special department of theology and religion.

The minister preaches what he calls "the Gospel," twice, thrice or four times in each week. He gets into each sermon as much of what he calls "the doctrines of grace" as he conveniently can, and makes the full circuit of them once in a year or two. His preaching, however, seems to produce little effect. Very few of his parishioners come out from "the world" to join his church. All are quiet and respectful hearers, but very few take the special interest in religion which he is striving to excite. He often feels discouraged at the prospect, scarcely hopes for success except through the special blessing of a "revival," and wonders at the delusion of those who ascribe so much influence to the ordinary labours of the ministry.

But constant dropping wears away stones. Even the least attentive hearers, by dint of frequent repetition, get a pretty accurate general idea of the change which the minister wishes to produce in them. They have a high respect for his character, entire confidence in his integrity, and a firm belief that he is right in those matters which it is his business to study and explain. But the sort of life which he affirms, and they believe, to be the religious life, however desirable in its final result, is not at present attractive or satisfactory to them, either in what it forbids or in what it enjoins; so, acknowledging themselves to be wrong, and determining, sometime or other, to change their course, they pursue, from year to year, a "worldly" life.

Even while leading this life, be it observed, they take upon trust, and firmly believe, the minister's theory, in opposition to their own practice. So that a young man who is regarded by his minister and his pious friends as a sad Sabbath-breaker, for instance, and who really has no fear to think his own thoughts, speak his own words, and do his own actions on Sunday, any more than on Monday, will yet vehemently controvert any anti-Sabbatarian doctrine which he chances to read or hear, and will really be shocked at the wickedness of one who tries to show from the Bible that the Sabbath was solely a Jewish institution, and that Christianity repudiates the idea that Monday or Wednesday is less sacred than Sunday.

But no one can enjoy permanent rest while thus divided against himself; and when severe sickness, or sudden imminent danger, or the death of a friend, or one of those periods of serious reflection which come, without special obvious cause, to every human being, impresses our young man with a determination to "seek religion," he seeks, as a matter of course, that which he has all his life heard the minister represent as religion, and seeks it in the way which he has thus heard (and taken for granted, without examination) to be the right way. He knows no other religion, and no other method of seeking it. And thus the seed which was sown on the stony way-side, after lying years inactive, at length springs up and brings forth fruit, such as it is.

Precisely in the same way, the Northern minister's influence in regard to slavery (comprising things taught and things omitted), for the most part, lies dormant in the minds of his congregation, but is ready to germinate and manifest itself whenever favourable circumstances appear. Nothing is more obvious than that the great mass of Northern clergymen, that is to say a *large majority* in each of the ten or twelve principal sects, hold, and for a century past have held, this position. They teach no principles of civil liberty and make no assertion of general human rights, except in connection with injuries felt or feared by their own sect; they do not assert the sinfulness of individual slaveholding, but, on the contrary, repudiate that idea when circumstances force them to express an opinion; such public notice as they take of slavery at all is generally in the prayer rather than the sermon, and in both cases it is treated rather as a calamity than a sin, the termination of which (in the indefinite future) is to be hoped for, rather by some occult and inscrutable operation of God's providence than by the intelligent and systematic action of men; and any movement on the part of others to combine and organize such action is usually ignored by them, until it enlists the sympathy and cooperation of some of their own people, when it is met by grave scruples, proceeding from the theological point of view, as, whether it is safe and right to take any position which would imply error on the part of Abraham, or Moses, or Job, or wisdom in ourselves "above that which is written," or which would condemn so many thousands of worthy slaveholding Christian brethren at the South, or which would strengthen the hands of men accused of heresy or infidelity anywhere. In short, their position is to stand still until others move, and then to hold back.

Now, what we assert is, that the majority of Northern parishioners are influenced by the position of their pastors on the subject of slavery just as they are on the subject of religion; that is to say, they care little or nothing about it until some local cause forces the subject on their attention, and then take, as a matter course, the side which their minister has taken. They consider him a wise as well as a good man; perhaps the wisest and best within their knowledge; and the constant habit, from childhood, of taking these two things for granted, gives them a quiet confidence in his opinions, scarcely less firm than thorough examination on their own part would produce.

When a young man of this sort (and this sort includes nine-tenths of the population of the Northern States) goes to the South, especially if he marries, or otherwise settles there, the seed long before sown, by his minister's doubt or denial of the sinfulness of slavery, begins to germinate. He finds it very inconvenient to live without buying or hiring slaves. Why should he submit to that inconvenience? He sees the slaves to be sometimes stupid, often grossly ignorant, and always degraded, and the free coloured people scarcely less so. The inference is easy, that they are unable to take care of themselves, and this is corroborated by the unanimous testimony of slaveholders. Why should he not do as others do? *Since slaveholding is not in itself wrong* (here the seed planted by his minister springs up, flourishes and bears much fruit), it is to be settled by expediency or convenience in each case, and his is the very case in which the expediency most plainly exists. It would be very strange if, with such preparation, and under such circumstances, the new comer did not fall in with the custom of the country, approved by his own spiritual guide, and authenticated by the practice of Christians (so-called and reputed) all around him; and the point once being settled that he *has a right* to regard men and women as *property*, he easily falls into the habit of *treating* them as property, according to his own passion, or avarice, or sensuality, and without regard either to their wishes or their welfare. If now, while living thus, he wishes, for any reason, to join the church, the character which we have described does not interpose the slightest obstacle, either to his reception as a member at the South, or as a communicant, "in good and regular standing," when he visits the North; and this result flows directly, and palpably, from the position occupied by this Northern minister in relation to slavery and anti-slavery.

Let us suppose that our National Constitution and laws, for a century past, had made as much provision for the toleration, continuance and support of polygamy as of slavery (including, of course, enactments that a man's political power should increase in proportion to the number of his wives, and that fugitive wives might be seized and carried back from any State in our Union), and suppose also that the clergy of the country, during that period, had acted towards polygamy as they actually have towards slavery. Let us briefly rehearse the details of this course, and see what would be its probable result.

For a hundred years, during which, according to the supposition, polygamy has been commonly practised by respectable people, in the church and in the ministry, as well as out of them, the clergy have refused to pronounce it a sin; they have welcomed to their churches and their pulpits, as Christian brethren, the most open practisers and defenders of it; they have represented Moses and the prophets as authorizing, and Christ and the Apostles as permitting it; they have denounced opposition to it on the part of others as a breach of Christian charity, refused their churches for meetings and their newspapers for articles against it, warned their parishioners against listening to its opposers elsewhere, and stigmatized opposition to it as a mark of fanaticism and error, if not of irreligion.

Under such a course of treatment by the religious teachers of the nation, would not polygamy now be fixed as a "peculiar institution" of this country? And should we err in calling the clergy its bulwark and defence, and holding them justly accountable for its continuance?

Just such a position, however, they have taken, and still hold, in regard to slavery. And for this position, and its natural results, we shall continue to hold them accountable.

THE CUBA-ANNEXATION CONSPIRACY.

WE are not sure that we have spoken heretofore of the Conference lately held at Ostend (Holland) of our chief Diplomatic Representatives abroad, Messrs. Mason, Buchanan, Soulé, &c.; but our intelligent readers have doubtless learned from other sources all that has been revealed respecting its origin and objects. The meeting has been supposed to be in some way connected with the Cuban-Annexation Conspiracy, but its proceedings have not yet been authoritatively divulged, and probably will not be for some time to come. Meanwhile we put on record the semi-official disclosure of the *Herald*, a paper likely to be well informed in respect to all the movements of the Slave Power. Our readers can determine for themselves the degree of credence due to its statements. There is much inherent probability in its story of the objects and results of the Conference alluded to.

"Our private advices enable us to state with certainty the result of the Ministerial and Ambassadorial Conference recently held at Ostend, and the object of which was, it appears, to determine upon a line of policy by which our difficulties with Spain would be adjusted, and that government induced to make reparation for past outrages and indignities upon our citizens and commerce, as well as security for the future.

"The Conference necessarily brought up for discussion the peculiar position in which the government of the United States is placed by the refusal of Spain to afford any suitable satisfaction for the Black Warrior and other outrages; or, indeed, to continue negotiations upon the subject. Matters have arrived at that crisis where nothing is left for the United States but either to abandon the whole question or to continue it in a manner which will afford no opportunity for further shuffling. Such being the opinion of Messrs. Buchanan, Mason and Soulé, we are not surprised to learn that they agreed to recommend that the government of the United States should declare, in effect, that our safety demanded and our interest required we should purchase or take Cuba at once.

"It is understood that Mr. McRae, our Consul at Paris, who arrived here in the Arabia, was the bearer of the despatches conveying this recommendation of the American Ministers, and urging upon the President immediately to make the avowal, and take steps to carry it into effect. The matter is now being deliberated upon by the Cabinet at Washington, and the country will look with deep interest to the result.

"Messrs. Buchanan, Mason and Soulé have also expressed their conviction that France and England are favourable to the sale of Cuba to the United States—a marked change having recently taken place in the policy of those countries in this respect. The tone of the English and French press would lead to a supposition that this was the case; but this is rendered more important by the official character of the information now in possession of our government.

"Mr. Buchanan is a statesman of experience and reflection, and his recommendation will necessarily carry with it great weight. It is difficult to imagine he would suggest the adoption of such a decided course were he not convinced not only that this is the proper time to strike a decisive blow, but that it is useless to expect Spain to do us justice unless compelled to it.

"Thus fortified, it is not improbable Mr. Pierce may act upon the advice now given. Whatever course is determined upon, the action must be prompt. The Cortes meets at Madrid next month. The ultimatum of the United States should be made known during its session.

"Should the Administration determine to take firm and progressive ground in this matter, it is supposed the home squadron will be sent to Havana, Matanzas and other ports of Cuba—thus lending a moral influence to the arguments used in favour of its acquisition. This will in all likelihood be the first indication given of the President's intention of acting upon the suggestions of Mr. Buchanan and his confreres. We look with interest to the development of the affair, but with little confidence in the firmness of the government at Washington."

LETTER FROM WILLIAM BIRNEY.

WE are glad to learn by the following letter from Mr. Birney that he is not the author of the scurrilous commentary upon the Philadelphia Woman's Rights Convention which was attributed to him by the correspondent of the *Rhode Island Freeman*. Having found the statement in a respectable newspaper, which we believed to be well informed and had no reason to suppose was under any malign influence, we copied it as an item of intelligence interesting to many of our readers, but without giving it entire credence.

Mr. Birney will perceive that we have omitted that portion of his letter in which he mentions the name of a gentleman who, he declares, is the author of the charge which he so indignantly denies. That is a point in no wise necessary to Mr. Birney's defence—at least so far as *our* readers are concerned—and we cannot consent to be drawn into controversy respecting it. Mr. Birney having had a difference with the gentleman to whom he alludes, *may* have accused him wrongfully, for aught that we know; and having too hastily given currency to one erroneous and unjust statement, it behooves us to be careful, while correcting that, not to make our columns the vehicle of another.

PHILADELPHIA, Nov. 4, 1854.

GENTLEMEN: My attention has been called to a paragraph in your paper of Nov. 4, in which you say:

"The NATIONAL WOMAN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION, recently held in Philadelphia, was remarkable alike for the dignity of its proceedings and the eloquence of its debates. The press of that city generally treated it and its objects with marked fairness and candour, and the impression made upon spectators was exceedingly favourable. The evidences of this were numerous and unmistakable. This being so, we are not a little surprised to learn that the *Sunday Times* of that city—*a paper understood to be under the editorial care of William Birney, Esq.*, formerly editor and proprietor of the *Daily Register* (now defunct)—misrepresented the Convention and the noble women who took part in it, in a manner at once inexcusable and shameful. The following is the language of the *Times*, as we find it quoted by the correspondent of the *Rhode Island Freeman*."

Here follows a paragraph as coarsely scurrilous as it is ungrammatical. Your comment upon it is one of great severity, although hypothetical.

Why you should be so ready to give publicity to a charge so degrading, made by an anonymous writer, I must leave to you to explain. The charge itself is not only false, but wilfully and maliciously so. The *Sunday Times* is *not* under my editorial care, and never has been. I have no connection with it either as editor or publisher, and no more control of its columns than of yours. I do not even know who is its editor, and have no relation with its publishers other than that they have some type set, at a certain price per thousand, in the book and newspaper department of my printing establishment. I may say further that I have not written a line, favourable or otherwise, about the *Woman's Rights Convention*, although I attended some of its meetings and listened with pleasure to several of the speakers.

The charge against me of abusing a Convention of ladies was compelled to seek a distant place for its publication. It would not be believed here. The people of Philadelphia know that my printing establishment is the only one in the city in which ladies are employed as compositors; that to maintain their right to labour, I have subjected myself to the unremitted persecutions of the Printers' Union and the consequences of a "strike" of every hand employed on my daily paper.

* * * * * *

By giving this contradiction a conspicuous place in the *Standard*, you can repair, in some degree, the injury you have done me, and show that, if you do hastily accredit slander, you are equally prompt to render homage to the truth.

With due respect, I remain, &c.

WILLIAM BIRNEY.

EXPULSION OF THE KIDNAPPER FROM WORCESTER.—A correspondent of the *Liberator* corrects several errors in the first accounts of the expulsion of Butman from Worcester, and relates some additional circumstances. The writer is evidently familiar with the facts. He says that Butman was not waited upon by a committee, as he ought to have been, and informed of the state of public feeling and of the objects of those who fostered the excitement occasioned by his presence. The story that he made violent demonstrations with a pistol is not true. He merely showed a pistol to one individual, saying, "This will take care of them," and then replaced it in his pocket. This was in the house, with but a few individuals present, and those his friends, he not knowing that the individual who saw the pistol was in sympathy with the watchers outside. On Sunday night the Mayor said to S. S. Foster that no one detested the character of the kidnapper more than himself—that he had spent the evening in the endeavour to ascertain if his business was of a dangerous character, but he could not find that it was; he had given his police instructions to render him no assistance whatever in kidnapping, under the penalty of instant dismission. The Mayor stopped an hour or two, conversing freely with the friends, but made no request to them to disperse, and censured none of their proceedings. The writer adds:

"No riotous or mobocratic violence was shown until the procession commenced its march to the dépôt, and at no time was there any attempt made by the authorities to disperse the multitude, as they appeared to be perfectly peaceful and honourable in their intention and action, until the march commenced, and it was the comparatively few highly-excited coloured friends who made all the offensive demonstrations; and yet, these were so determined and powerful that it required all the physical strength of the non-resistant S. S. Foster, of T. W. Higginson, Martin Stowell, George F. Hoar, and others, to save him from utter destruction. And they did save him, so that he escaped nearly unharmed—the stories of his being kicked and pounded nearly to death to the contrary notwithstanding. He received a few blows, but they came over the heads

Our Philadelphia Correspondence.

INGRAHAM, THE SLAVE-COMMISSIONER, DEAD.

MESSRS. EDITORS: Ingraham, the notorious slave-commissioner, is dead. He died suddenly, in this city, on Sunday evening. The fact was made known yesterday, in the afternoon papers, and was everywhere received with expressions of undisguised satisfaction. To the coloured people the announcement was glad tidings of great joy, and to no class of our people was the news unwelcome. Never have I known any man to die less lamented. The event was one of joy to many and of grief to none.

Perhaps this is saying too much. Alberti will mourn the loss, for to him it will be an irreparable bereavement. Who will now make out slave-warrants for him, or where will he even find such another coadjutor?

The *Evening Bulletin*, too, seems to lay the death of the slave-commissioner much to heart. The editor of that paper had a copious obituary on the subject, yesterday, in its leading editorial column. One not acquainted with the facts would suppose, on reading the article, that Philadelphia had lost one of its brightest ornaments, and that humanity had been called to suffer a disaster. There is no man so low that cannot find some one to do him reverence, nor any public man so debased as to die without a eulogist. Even the notorious Ingraham is praised by the editor of the *Evening Bulletin*.

With the exception, however, of Alberti and the *Bulletin* man, the papers of Philadelphia seem to regard the death of Ingraham as a Providential deliverance and one to be acknowledged with devout gratitude. It is an event that has been looked forward to with a good deal of impatience, though it was expected to be brought about in a somewhat different way. Many a time I have heard it said, when Ingraham was performing the villanous franchise of his office and ordering the chains to be put on some new victim, "Why is such a man suffered to live?" "It is a marvel that the coloured people have not long since taken his life." The feeling evinced in expressions of this kind—expressions which were in the mouths of all classes of people—was not the sort to make the event we are talking of very unwelcome.

De mortuis, nil nisi bonum, is an old maxim, but one in which I have not much faith. "Say nothing of the dead but what is *true*," would be a better one, as well as a sounder rule of action. Edward D. Ingraham was a bad man. If, as the *Bulletin* represents him, he was a man of talent, learned in his profession, and a scholar, so much the less excuse for him. He was, certainly, a man of a coarse and vulgar nature, and one utterly devoid of all moral sensibility. From time immemorial, he has been the main legal adviser and advocate at this bar of the slave-catchers. When appointed slave-commissioner under the Fugitive Law of 1850, he seemed to be in the very place for which his nature and rank had fitted him. As an advocate, he was the means of sending back more hapless victims to the South than, perhaps, all the other lawyers put together; and, as a commissioner, no poor creature that was brought before him ever found a ray of mercy. Every one that was ever arraigned at his bar—not excepting Adam Gibson, the man who was proved to be a freeman by the most positive testimony—was adjudged to slavery and sent South in chains. Ingraham issued more warrants, and was the means of more arrests, than any other slave-commissioner in the United States. It was under his writ that the first slave case was held, and by his sentence that the last victim was sent back. He issued the warrant that led to the Christiana tragedy, and it was he that ordered the chains to be put on poor Massey, whose case you noticed but a few weeks since in your paper. These things being so, judge ye whether or not I have done the memory of the man any injustice. *De mortuis, nil nisi*, VERUM. Yours ever truly, O. P. C.

MICHIGAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

THE *Bugle* brings us the proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Michigan Anti-Slavery Society, which was held at Adrian, Oct. 14th, 15th and 16th. In the absence of the President, the chair was occupied by Jacob Walton, one of the Vice-Presidents. The following persons were chosen officers for the ensuing year:

President—CYRUS FULLER, Plymouth.
Vice-Presidents—Joseph Merritt, Battle Creek; Maria Day, Hickory Grove; Abraham Power, Farmington; C. E. Mickley, Fairfield; J. H. Parker, Racine.
Recording Secretary—Eliphalet Jones, Adrian.
Corresponding Secretary—Jacob Walton, Adrian.
Treasurer—Samuel Hayball, Adrian.
Executive Committee—Edwin Comstock, William Ward, and Thomas Chandler, Adrian; Frances S. Mott, Hickory Grove; Ann Hayball, Adrian.

The debates of the meeting, if we may judge from the *Bugle's* sketches, were exceedingly interesting. Among those who took part in them were C. C. Burleigh, Rev. A. T. Foss, C. S. S. and Josephine S. Griffing, Jonathan Walker, James Barnaby, and Samuel D. Moore. Several Free Soilers attempted to defend the constitutional views of their party, but their success was not remarkable.

The sum of $274 was received by the Finance Committee, and something was done to promote the circulation of the *Bugle*.

The resolutions adopted were radical and thorough. We will publish them next week.

SLAVEHOLDING PROJECT. — The Philadelphia *Ledger* announces that a distinguished warlike Senator of the United States—meaning General Shields—is about to take the lead in an enterprise for the colonization of the Musquito Coast, and that he will depart in a few weeks for the scene of action. The *Tribune* says it is able to complete this piece of intelligence by the statement that this enterprise is nothing less than another form of the so-called Central American Land and Mining Company, in which the Attorney-General of the United States is a directing spirit, and of which Senator Cooper, of Pennsylvania, was to have been the Agent in Central America; but circumstances having prevented his going there, the Senator from Illinois takes his place. Mr. Minister Wheeler and Mr. Ex-Consul Fabens, who have just sailed from Norfolk in the Princeton, are also charged with negotiations in behalf of this land company, for whose benfit, mainly, the destruction of Greytown was ordered by Messrs. Pierce and Marcy. The Company claim the Musquito Coast by virtue of a worthless grant from a former Chief of the Mosquito tribe to certain Englishmen named Stephen and Haley. This grant has been repeatedly disowned by the English authorities and by the present Chief, and in fact was never of any value. But our speculators hope, by one means or another, to procure the recognition of it by Nicaragua or Costa Rica, and then to attract colonists into the country by the wealth of its mines and the fertility of its soil.

The *Tribune* adds:

"That their plan is exclusively directed to the formation of new slave States in that region we will not affirm; but we know that they represent it in that light to Southern men, and especially to slaveholders, to whom they promise great advantages from the ultimate removal thither of their human chattels. Accordingly, we have already warned the Northern people against this scheme, and now repeat the monition. The United States needs no new tropical territory, and the citizens of the North will never tolerate the admission into the Union of another slave State, above all if that State come in by way of conquest or annexation."

Rev. CHARLES W. DENNISON.—We learn that this apostate from the anti-slavery cause has made his appearance in Philadelphia, where he is labouring to inveigle the coloured people into a scheme connected in some way with emigration to the island of Demarara. The impudence of the fellow in pretending to any regard for the people of colour, or even daring to show himself among them, since his shameless betrayal of their cause, in going over to the support of the Fugitive Slave law and receiving first a chaplaincy in the Penitentiary at Washington under Fillmore, and then a consulship from Franklin Pierce, as a reward for his treachery, is a little the *coolest* exhibition of the season. If the coloured people of Philadelphia are weak enough (which we do not believe) to be caught in any trap that may be set for them by such a worthless renegade, they will deserve the worst that can follow. He is no more worthy of confidence than the meanest slave-catcher in the land; and, indeed, we should not be at all surprised to learn that his object in visiting Philadelphia is in some way connected with the capture of fugitives. At any rate, it will be safe for the coloured people to give him a wide berth.

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

EXTRACTS FROM THE DIARY OF AN ABOLITIONIST DOWN SOUTH.

NO. IV.

IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Sept. 28.—Same place as before. I took a walk in the woods. Suddenly I came upon the regular road. A coloured man, driving a horse and wagon, was approaching. I accosted him and got into the wagon.

We soon began to talk about slavery.

He said that he had often seen me within the last few days; and that the people in this district were very much afraid of the Abolitionists coming down here and advising the negroes to run away. Whenever a stranger came here, they asked one another who he was and used every means in their power to discover his business. He advised me not to trust the free coloured population, because many of them were mean enough to go straight to the white people and tell them that a stranger had been talking to them about freedom. He advised me, also, to be cautious with many of the slaves, because there were many of them who would go and tell. But there are many, too, who would rather die than betray an Abolitionist.

He said that he would run the risk of capture if he had a compass or had a friend to direct him to the North. Ignorance of the way, he said, was the chief obstacle in preventing the slaves in this district from escaping to the North. Dozens were ready to fly.

We came up to a coloured man who was chopping in the woods. "Now there," said the wagoner, "there is a man who would not tell what you said to him, and would like very much to get the chance of being free."

We had previously met a boy driving oxen drawing logs to town. This man was chopping the trees for him. They both belonged to the same master—who is described by his slaves, as well as by other coloured people, as a perfect Legree.

We met, also, two wagons laden with cotton. "These," said the wagoner with whom I was conversing, "these come from right away up in the country, and very likely these boys—the drivers—have traveled all night."

I bade the wagoner farewell and went up to the exeman.

He was a powerful, resolute-looking negro, and a caste in one of his eyes gave him an almost savagely dogged appearance.

"Good day, friend."
"Good day, mass'r."
"You are a slave?"
"Yes, sir."
"Who do you belong to?"
"Mr. D——."
"I am told he is a pretty hard master."

A pause, during which I am examined physiologically.

"I come from the North."
"Yes, sir," said the slave, who seemed to be satisfied with my appearance, "he is a very hard master."
"Have you ever run away?"
"Yes; I have run away twice."
"Did you run North?"
"No," he replied, "I am told no one can get to the North from here without being taken. Besides, I don't know the way."
"How far did you run?"
"I just went round to the next county."
"If you knew the way to the North, would you try to get there? Would you run the risk of being captured and brought back?" I asked.
"Yes, mass'r," said the slave, in a manly tone, "I would try—but they would never bring me back again alive."

I explained the nature and uses of a compass.

"If I gave you one of these things, would you risk it?"
"Yes, mass'r, I would; but I would like to have a pistol and a knife too."

He said that he did not care about the hardships a runaway must endure; for they could not be greater than the hardships he endured with his present owner.

"Would you be afraid, or would you hesitate for one moment, to shoot a man if he tried to capture you?" I asked.
"No, sir," he said, as if he meant what he said; "I would shoot him rather than be taken again; for they would kill me anyhow if they got me back again."
"Good—you deserve to be free. Has your boss ever killed any of his slaves?"
"He killed one. The boy ran away; and when they got him back, they lashed him and kicked him about so that he only lived a week."
"Does he often lash them?"
"Oh, very often," said the slave.
"How many does he give them at a time?"
"Fifty and seventy-five, and a hundred sometimes. I saw three men get seventy-five a-piece last Sunday. He drives them very hard; and if they don't work like beasts, he lashes them himself; or if he is too tired to do it, he gets his son or a coloured man to do it for him."
"I should think," said I, "that seventy-five lashes would be enough to kill a man."
"Oh," said the slave, "it is very bad, but they have to go to their work again the same as ever. He just washes their back down with salt water and sends them to work again."
"Washes their sore backs with salt water!" I exclaimed in horror—for although I *knew* that this operation is frequently performed in South Carolina, I cannot hear of it without a shudder—"What do they do that for?" I added.
"To take the soreness out of it," he replied. (It is to prevent it festering, I believe.)
"But," I repeated, "is it not very painful to be washed in that way?"
"Yes, sir, very," said the slave, "but that doesn't make any difference. He (the boss) does not care for that."
"What are your working hours?"
"From two hours before daylight till ten o'clock at night."
"Do you think that the slaves are more discontented now than they used to be?"
"Yes, sir," said he, "they are getting more and more discontented every year. The times is getting worse and worse with us, 'specialy," he added, "since these engines have come in here."
"What difference do they make?" I asked, thinking that he alluded to the Indians.
"Why," said he, "you see it is so much easier to carry off the produce and sell it now; 'cause they take it away so easy; and so the slaves are drov more and more to raise it."
"I see. Do you think that if we could give the slaves these things I told you about, that lots of them would run away?" I asked, alluding, of course, to pocket compasses.
"Lots and lots on them," said he, "emphasizing every syllable.
"Would you run away even without a pistol?"
"Yes, sir," said he, "I would risk it; but I would rather have a pistol and knife, if possible, too."
"How did you live before, when you ran away?"
"I walked about at night and kept mighty close all day."
"Yes; but where did you get food?"
"I went to the houses of my friends about here and they gave me something to eat."
"I suppose you would like to have some money, too, if you were going to the North?"
"Yes, mass'r," said he, "I would like to, 'cause if a man has money, he can get food easily anywhere, and he can't always without it. But I would try it, even without money."
"Are you married?"
"Yes, sir."
"Any children?"
"No, sir."
"What would you do with your wife, if you were to run away?"
"I would have to leave her. She would be very willing," he added, "'cause she knows she can't help me, and I might help her if I was once free."
"How old are you?"
"Thirty-five."
"How many suits of clothing do you get in the year?"
"Two."
"Only one shirt at a time?"
"Yes!"

(The shirts of the slaves in this State—of course I allude to rural slaves—appear to be a cross between a "gent's under-clothing" and a potato bag. The cloth is *very* thick.)

"Does the boss allow you anything for yourself?"
"Nothing," said he; and, looking at his *blazé* boots, (!) he added:
"He hardly keeps us in shoes."
"Are you ready to run away as soon as I can give you one of the things I told you about?"
"I will run away to-night," he replied, firmly, "if you can give me one of them."
"You will see me again in a few months: I will get you one: good bye, old boy."

EMANCIPATION!

Sept. 29.—If I had a good stock of pocket compasses and revolving pistols, I would not leave this State until I had liberated at least one hundred slaves. Already I have spoken to great numbers of them—negroes and mulattoes—resolute and bold men, who are ready to fly, if they but knew the route, and had the means of defending themselves from bloodhounds, whether bipeds or quadrupeds.

If I could for one year command the resources of the Anti-Slavery Society, I believe that I could make it the most formidable Emancipation Society that the world ever saw.

Let not the Abolitionists of the North be deceived. The South will *never* liberate her slaves unless compelled by FEAR to do so; or unless the activity of the Abolitionists renders human property so insecure a possession as to be comparatively worthless to its owner.

Abolitionists of the North! would you liberate the slaves of the South as speedily as possible? I will tell you how to do it within ten, or, at furthest, twenty years.

First. Fight with all your hearts, souls and strengths until the Fugitive Slave Law be repealed. As soon as the Northern States are as secure against the invasions of the slaveholder as is Canada, three-fourths of our coming victory will be won.

Second. Carry the war into the South. Brothers! we have fought the battle long enough in the Northern States. We have conquered the hosts of the oppressor there. The defenders of slavery are rapidly returning into the Southern States. Let us follow and fight them until the last man falls!

In the South, there are three great parties—the slaveholder, the pro-slavery non-slaveholder and the anti-slavery non-slaveholder. Great numbers of the slaveholders secretly believe slavery to be a curse—and some of them would liberate their slaves if appealed to in the proper spirit. Let arguments in favour of Abolition—*especially arguments extracted from the writings of Southern Statesmen*—be diligently circulated amongst this class of slaveholders. Argue not with the other class of slaveholders—for you cannot convince *them* of the sin of slavery.

Appeals should be addressed to good men; proofs that slavery is a curse to the non-slaveholding population—by increasing their taxes, driving away commerce, manufactories and capital from the State—which can easily be done—should be offered to the pro-slavery non-slaveholders who are invulnerable to ideas of justice.

Let the *anti-slavery* population of the South be associated by forming a Secret Society, similar to the Free Masons or Odd Fellows, and let this Union be extended over the entire Continent.

These Societies could circulate tracts, assist slaves in escaping, and direct the movements of the agents of the Grand Lodge.

Third. Begin at the Borders. In every free Border town and village, let an Underground Railroad be in active operation. Appoint a small band of bold but cautious men to travel in the most Northern slave States for the purpose of securing the co-operation of the free-coloured population in assisting fugitives; of disseminating discontent among the slaves themselves, and providing the most energetic of them who wish to escape with pocket compasses, pistols and directions. Such agents must be consummate men of the world—"wise as serpents," though formidable as lions! An incautious man would soon be betrayed either by free blacks or by sycophant-slaves; and a man incapable of judging of character by physiological indices would waste both his time and his stock.

Ten or twelve such apostles of Freedom could, in one year, easily induce six or seven thousand slaves to fly to the North; of which, if they were properly equipped, at least five thousand would escape from bondage forever. Unarmed and without *any* money with which to purchase food, at least one half of the fugitives would be captured by the bloodhounds.

There are many ways of enabling fugitives to escape *rapidly* and by a direct route for the free States, which these agents could employ; but which, of course, must be kept a secret from the slaveholders.

Schemes seldom command much respect: and every bold plan is at once pronounced impractical by the Gradgrinds of this world.

For example, in this my scheme of emancipation, it will be objected that few properly qualified agents could be found to go upon so *dangerous* a mission. The anticipated success, also, would be doubted.

Now, so confident am I of the practicability of this plan, that I offer to carry it into effect, in the Spring of 1855, if the Anti-Slavery Society or any wealthy Abolitionist will provide me with *stock*. I will give all that I have to give—for silver and gold have I none—*my time, for three months.* I am certain that at least seven-eighths of the pistols, compasses and dollars I gave the slaves would be surrendered to our agents in the Free Cities of the North.

I would try to carry my scheme into effect immediately—but private business, of an imperative nature, requires my presence in the West India Islands this Winter.

You will hear from me again. Meanwhile, let us fight with ardour the good fight of Abolitionism! Remember, brothers! that "Southern Rights are Human Wrongs."

JOHN BALL, JR.

SECRET PLOTTING.—The *Tribune* has an anonymous letter from Missouri, stating that a secret organization exists in all the upper counties of that State, the object of which is to carry slavery into Kansas at all hazards. Men are pledged to repair to that Territory on the night preceding the election, present themselves at the polls the next day, and cast their suffrages for slavery and its candidates. The Society is said to number several thousand members already. Senator Atchison has the credit of originating it, and the Rev. Thomas Johnson, late delegate in Congress from Nebraska, is employing it to foist himself into the same position from Kansas.

This story *may* be false, but it is likely enough to prove true. The large emigration to Kansas from the North has alarmed the slavery conspirators, and they will, no doubt, resort to any measures, however desperate, to secure the objects which they have so much at heart.

PUTNAM FOR NOVEMBER.—In the September No. of Putnam, it will be remembered, was an article on American Parties, which gave great offence to the 'King of the South,' not because it disputed the fact of his reigning, but because it questioned, in bold and unmeasured terms, that he was of the powers 'ordained of God.' That article—we believe it is an open secret—lost Putnam almost the whole, if not the whole, of his Southern circulation. How much this might be, we know not, but, whether great or little, we have been curious to see how a popular Magazine would take a *taboo* which must certainly be a positive, immediate loss, and might seem, to a timid publisher, to threaten a prospective one. The October No. was silent on the subject, but that for November has spoken in a very unequivocal tone, and we copy the evidence of it on the fourth page of our this week's issue. The article is not only in itself well worth reading, but we may well rejoice in it also that the Magazine thereby takes its stand upon the right of a free press, and with a becoming dignity refutes its assailants, and brushes off the flies that intended to sting it to death. It is the more admirable that there is little in it that could be supposed, by one ignorant of the circumstances, as a special defence, while, at the same time, its avowal of principle is so clear that those who do understand will not again be likely to suppose that Putnam's is to be driven by persecution, petty or otherwise, from any ground that it deliberately takes.

This single fact in the history of this Magazine, apart from its general merit, ought to commend it to the increased support of the North, and we hope it will. It is really, in these days, a thing to thank God for, that we have one periodical which is not only willing to confess, but boldly declares, that it has a soul of its own.

THE TRACT FUND.—In another column will be found the acknowledgment of the first responses to the appeal for funds for the publication of Tracts. It is a good beginning, and indicates how favourably the scheme has struck some of those who are always the readiest and most generous contributors to the Anti-Slavery Treasury. If this good example shall be generally followed and all to whom the Circular has been sent shall respond as liberally—as we cannot but hope will be the case—the means placed in the hands of the Committee for the circulation of these Tracts will be ample to ensure a very decided and positive impression upon the public mind. We take the liberty of adding the letter received by Mr. Jackson with the first donation, as one of good augury, for it is hoped that in such a spirit the Circular will be everywhere received.

BOSTON, Oct. 27, 1854.

MR. FRANCIS JACKSON: I enclose you ten dollars to aid the fund for Tracts and Lectures: admiring your perseverance and wishing you unbounded success.

Believe me with great respect,
HENRIETTA SARGENT.

FRANCIS JACKSON, Treasurer of the Am. A. S. Society.

THE CHOSEN PREACHER of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, for its next anniversary, is the Rev. Nehemiah Adams, D.D., of Boston, a supporter of the Fugitive Slave law, and the man who declared, in a sermon, some years since, that the Golden Rule, as a standard of action, "had its exceptions." He is the reverend doctor whose correspondence with Henry A. Wise the country is not yet done laughing at. We have a right to infer that the Board regards him as a sound preacher of the gospel which it wishes to send to the heathen. Those who believe in the Divinity of slave-catching and that the Golden Rule is not binding upon white Christians in their relations to the negroes may well sustain such an association; but can any honest opponent of slavery consistently contribute one cent to its support? We trow not.

NEW YORK STATE ELECTION.—The result of the election held in this State, on Tuesday, is at this present writing (Thursday morning) involved in uncertainty. It seems probable, however, that Seymour, the Rum Democratic Soft Candidate, is chosen Governor: yet the friends of Clark, the regular Whig anti-Nebraska and Temperance nominee, are not without hope that the returns yet to come in will elect him; and the Know-Nothings loudly claim a victory for Ullman. The liquor dealers have spent money with a lavish hand and gained many votes for Seymour from the anti-Temperance Whigs and Hards; while the Silver Grays and the Know-Nothings, whose animating spirit is hostility to Seward, have contrived by secret and fraudulent means to diminish the vote of Clark and increase that of Ullman. It is said—and we see no reason to doubt the truth of the statement—that hundreds of the Whig vote distributors in various parts of the State, while pretending to act in good faith for that party, destroyed or kept out of sight the Whig ballots and substituted therefor those which had been concocted in the lodges of the Know-Nothings! "Sometimes," says the *Tribune*, the latter "were examined, and their true nature discovered; but the bewildered voter was told that these were the only Whig ballots to be had—that the Whigs were all going them—that this or the Rum ticket must be elected—and finally they were persuaded to float with the current. Some refused to do this, and either discovered a Whig ticket somewhere, or were obliged to go home without voting. Thus was Ullman's vote swelled, while Clark's was diminished to a still greater extent."

The contest for Lieutenant-Governor is between Raymond (Whig and anti-Nebraska) and Scroggs (Know-Nothing). The *Tribune* thinks Raymond's chance is best, and that the rest of the Whig State ticket is elected.

The returns for Members of Congress are far from complete. On this subject we quote the *Times*:

"The Congressional vote is encouraging. As a general thing, so far as it was felt at all, the Know-Nothing movement aided the Whig and Anti-Nebraska members; and out of the 16 Districts decisively heard from, 12 have returned decided Anti-Nebraska men, two of whom are Democrats. We are rejoiced to know that John Wheeler, who braved the power of the Administration and the severest drill of his own party, in resistance to this outrage, has been returned. So has Andrew Oliver, the Anti-Nebraska Democratic member from the Seneca District. In the Albany District, Dickson, Whig, succeeds by a few votes over the Know-Nothing."

That prince of rowdyism, Mike Walsh, is defeated by Kelly, a Soft, and, we presume, a Nebraskaite. No great gain.

The Assembly is "all a muddle" at present, though it will probably be Whig, if anybody can tell what that means.

FERNANDO WOOD, the Rum candidate, is elected Mayor of this city. Well, perhaps the *worst* that could happen may turn out *best* in this case. It may be well for the city to dive at once to the very bottom of the pit of rascality and pollution. It may purify itself the sooner

DICKENS'S HOUSEHOLD WORDS—*American Reprint*—for October contains an attractive variety of matter of the sort which usually fills the pages of that excellent periodical. It may be had in weekly numbers of 24 pages for 6 1-4 cents; $3 for a year. The numbers for a year make two volumes, each of which may be had, bound, for $1.75. We commend the work to any family that is in want of choice reading for the winter evenings.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE—*Contents of No. 546.*—Illustration—Parisian Female Scavengers.
An Almshouse in Shopshire.
Sketches and Anecdotes of Animal Life.
Mayhew's Dogs.
What is an Oval Gun.
Songs of the Dramatists.
Doctor Pantologus.
To Map a Smell.
Mr. Calhoun's Dying Hours.
Science and Arts—Electric Railway Lamp; Electro-Magnetic Weaving Machine; New Method with Ores; New Flux for Iron, &c.; Electric Telegraph in Astronomy; Aluminum; Quinine; Incrustation of Boilers; New Alcohol; Foucault; Oceanic Survey; Weight of the Earth; Carrier Swallows; Eastern Africa, &c. &c.
Protestantism of China.
Psychological Inquiries.
Bell's Edition of Wyatt's Poems.
Poetry—Mosses; Stuart Holland; What may be Ours.
Short Articles—Bible Society in France, Turkey, Spain; Aquatic Weed; Heathen Notion of Baptism; It is good to be Sure.

Published in Boston by Littell, Son & Co.

Summary.

SINGULAR INCOME.—The church of All Hallows, in London, still possesses an income originally given to it for the purpose of buying faggots for burning heretics.

ONE OF "THE SETTLERS."—The Monroe (Md.) *Sentinel* says: Mr. Powell, an old Revolutionary soldier, ninety-five years of age, with his wife, seventy-five, left here, on the 18th ult., for Nebraska, in company with several citizens. Mr. P. is remarkably vigorous, capable of chasing a deer, with a rifle a-shoulder, 26 miles a day.

A negro man named Taylor, the property of J. M. Bunton, of Logan county, Ky., committed suicide by hanging himself on Sunday night last. It being the intention of his master to remove to Texas, it is thought the boy became dissatisfied, and committed the act rather than go there.

A BAD BLUNDER IN THE INDIANA ELECTION.—By some mistake, not yet explained, twenty-two counties of Indiana are returned as having voted for Wm. F. Noffsinger for State Treasurer, and the number of votes thus returned is 23,367. Deducting them from the vote for William R. Noffsinger, it elects Elijah Newstand, the Nebraska candidate, by about 11,000 majority.

NEWSPAPER TRANSFER.—The *Evening Gazette* (Boston) learns that Frederick Gleason, Esq., has disposed of his interest in *Gleason's Pictorial* and *Flag of our Union* newspapers, to Maturin M. Ballou, Esq., for the round sum of $200,000. This is the largest newspaper sale ever effected in this country. Mr. Gleason retires with an ample fortune. Mr. Ballou has been editor of the two publications since their commencement.—*Boston Telegraph.*

"It is a fact," says the New York *Observer*, "that of all the religious papers in New England, not ONE—alas that we must say it, NOT ONE has raised a voice of remonstrance against the stand now taken by the American Board." It might have added, says the *Congregationalist*, that all *approve* the stand, and bear their united testimony against a legislation that binds the Bible which God has *not* bound, and ignores the immortality of the slave's soul, and shuts him up to ignorance on every subject that concerns him as a *man*, not as a chattel.

The South is a spoiled child, which, if refused what it asks for, always threatens to throw itself down stairs. The North is a foolish nurse, which believes it will fulfil its threat, becomes frightened, and fussily goes and gets for it whatever it may fancy it wants. It is said, however, that the old nurse is beginning of late to doubt whether she has taken the wisest course with her wayward charge, and has made up her mind, whenever the threat is repeated, to see whether any serious attempt will be made to put it in execution.—*Times.*

An old farmer—one who feared neither God nor man—had hired a devout negro; and to get some Sunday work out of him, would always plan a case of "necessity" on Saturday, and on Sunday morning would put this point to the man's conscience. And this morning Sambo proved refractory. "He would work no more on Sunday." The master argued with him that it was a case of "necessity"—that the Scripture allowed a man to get out of a pit on the Sabbath day a beast that had fallen in. "Yes, massa," rejoined the black, "but not if he spent Saturday in digging de pit for de berry purpose."

THE MAINE LAW IN CANADA.—The Maine Law has passed the Legislative Assembly of Canada by a vote of 85 to 5, and it will doubtless pass the Council and immediately become a law. Thus Canada precedes the majority of the States in the enactment of this great Democratic measure for the prevention of crime and pauperism. However, they will all follow the example.

It is probable, as we are assured by our correspondent at Quebec, that the importation of liquors and wines will finally be prohibited in the Canadas, as well as their sale.—*Tribune.*

SYRACUSE. — The announcement that Mr. Rogers (a man as black as seven midnights) was to read a poem in Mr. May's church, last night, drew together a large audience, who, we venture to say, went away very much disappointed. Certainly we expected no such treat. The poem was a terse, vigorous review of the achievements of Slavery, in the style of Hudibras or McFingal, and not inferior in wit or power to either. It was a long way in advance of the annual effusions of Park Benjamin; and had it been read by that gentleman, would have produced a deep impression. Mr. Rogers has charge of a coloured church in the city of Newark.—*Syracuse Chronicle.*

THE COLOURED SCHOOL QUESTION AGAIN.—It will be seen by the Court Report elsewhere, that a jury of the Common Pleas Court has snstained the practice of the separation of children of the city in school instruction. We record with pleasure that Mr. Hillard, the City Solicitor, while defending the cause of the city, had the frankness and magnanimity to say that he believed the law in question an unjust one. Some months ago, Alderman Williams made an excellent report to the Board on this subject, recommending the School Committee to take action towards the abolition of coloured schools. We trust it will not be long before this suggestion is acted upon favourably.—*Boston Telegraph.*

A QUEER BLUNDER.—A good brother in an eastern church had a call to preach. Being unable to read, he employed a friend to read the Scripture lesson. On one occasion the chapter selected was Genesis xxii, which contains the words, "These eight did Micah bear to Nahor, Abraham's brother." The preacher discoursed therefrom as follows: Brethren and sisters, let us consider our blessings. Morning and evening our wives and daughters milk the cows, and our wants are all supplied. In the days of good old Abraham, as you have heard, it took eight to milk a bear, and they did not get much at that.

TICKETED TROUGH. — At present, human ingenuity seems to be taxed to the utmost to suggest means by which the lives of passengers may be saved, even if a vessel goes down at sea. The last, and perhaps the best, we find in the Boston *Transcript.* It is the suggestion of an old sea captain, and contemplates a sufficient number of life-boats to accommodate the passengers and crew; each boat to be provided with a compass, water and food, and to be numbered and placed under the command of an officer of the vessel. As each person takes passage in the vessel he is also ticketed for a position in one of the life boats, so that, in case of accident, each one knows where he belongs.—*Eastern Portland (Me.) Argus.*

EX-PRESIDENT VAN BUREN.—A Paris correspondent of the N. Y. Evening *Post* says that Mr. Van Buren (who is now at Vevay, in Switzerland) is actually and earnestly engaged upon a history of his life, and has already advanced some two or three hundred pages with it. The *Post* says: "Mr. Van Buren's life has been a singular, eventful and instructive one, and it is due both to himself and his friends that he should leave some written record of those portions, especially, of his career to which he alone has the key. Mr. Van Buren has had a wider political experience, and held more exalted public stations, than have ever been held by any other person in this country since the formation of the government. He is the only person who has held its four highest offices, President, Vice-President, Secretary of State, and Minister to England. He was also a United States Senator, Governor of the State of New York, Attorney-General of the State, State Senator, and Surrogate of the county of Columbia."

THIRTY HOURS IN THE TRIBUNE'S PRESS ROOM.—J. W. Richards, foreman of the *Tribune* press-room, says: "Allow me to give your readers a statement of what was done in the press-room of your establishment on Thursday and part of Friday, the 26th and 27th inst. We commenced at 4 o'clock, A. M., on Thursday, and in thirty hours we had printed and mailed one hundred and eighty-two thousand four hundred copies of *The New York Tribune*, or three hundred and sixty-four thousand eight hundred impressions. By far the larger portion of the blank paper was received during Thursday forenoon, and of course had to be wet and turned. Had this paper been all in one pile, it would have reached the height of seventy feet; its weight, when mailed, would be about twenty-two thousand eight hundred pounds; in cubical measurement, about seven hundred and five feet and a half; its superficial measurement, if all spread out, would be about forty-two and a quarter acres; the lineal measurement would reach about one hundred and twenty-six and two-third miles."

Donations to the Tract Fund.

Henrietta Sargent, Boston	$10 00
Cornelius Wellington, "	1 00
James Jackson, "	2 00
Edmund Jackson, "	10 00
Francis Jackson, "	20 00
John R. Manley, "	10 00
David Merritt, Salem Mass	5 00
Josiah Hayward, "	5 00
Perley King, "	2 00
Mr. Sanger, "	1 00
Dougald Ferguson, Cold Spring, N. Y.	1 00
Gulielmer Knowles, Mechanicsville, Saratoga Co., N. Y.	3 00
Pliny Sexton, Palmyra, N. Y.	5 00
William Spooner, Plymouth, Mass.	2 00
J. C. Lindsley, Dorchester, "	5 00
Dr. Jesse Merrill, Hopkinton, "	5 00
William Buffum, Salem, "	1 00
William Chase, "	2 00
Mrs. Polly Ashby, "	2 00
William J. Whitaker, Washington, D. C.	1 45
Isaac Ivins, Bordentown, N. J.	7 00
Total	$90 45

F. JACKSON.

MARRIED.

WRIGHT—GREIST.—On Fourth Day, the 25th of Tenth Month, at Friends' Meeting, Menallen, Abel T. Wright to Jane C. Greist, daughter of Cyrus Griest, all of Menallen Township, Adams Co., Pa.

Acknowledgments, &c., from Oct. 1 to Nov. 1, FOR STANDARD.

438	Mary Whiting, Canton, Ohio	$2 00
692	Luther Bartlett, Fort Covington, N. Y.	5 00
794	Sarah H. Marshall, N. Y. City	2 00
750	Enos Soule, Savannah, N. Y.	2 00
764	John Dymlyn, Newville, N. Y.	2 00
786	O. Cushing, South Hingham, Mass.	2 00
	Dublin Ladies' A. Society, Ireland	3 00
770	A. F. Laing, Six Mile Run, N. J.	2 00
758	Henry V. B. Treadwell, N. Y. City	50
728	Weare Tappan, Bradford, N. H.	1 00
798	Nathan Page, Davenport, Mass.	2 00
747	Joseph L. Paxson, Norristown, Pa.	1 08
798	Miss Adeline Whiton, Hingham, Mass.	2 00
780	Mrs. Cordelia Adams, "	2 00
766	Marvin Hibbard, Randolph, Vt.	2 00
720	Samuel Woodruff, Ludlowville, N. Y.	2 00
750	Alexander Welch, "	2 00
780	Mrs. Nicholas Hallock, Milton, N. Y.	4 00
776	Thomas Jackson, Yorkshire, Eng.	1 56
797	Daniel W. Cole, Fairfield, N. Y.	2 00
772	John Wilbur, Easton, N. Y.	2 00
705	Lewis Ferris, Five Corners, N. Y.	2 80
760	Anti-Slavery Society, Otto, N. Y.	3 00
790	Sarah C. Owen, Stoney Run, Mich.	4 00
780	Geo. R. Russell, Jamaica Plains, Mass.	6 00
770	Miss Sarah Bruce, Hanover, Mass.	4 00
780	Neal Dow, Portland, Me.	6 00
800	J. Walpole, Keeseville, N. Y.	2 00
798	Rhoda Beale, Hingham, Mass.	2 00
789	Lydia Andrews, "	2 00
798	Mary T. Tidmarsh, "	2 00
798	Elizabeth Cushing, "	2 00
778	David Ketchum, Pleasant Valley, N. Y.	2 00
767	Francis J. Higginson, Brattleboro, Vt.	5 00
784	N. Mulliken, Lexington, Mass.	4 00
804	Virginia L. Porter, Sandy Spring, Md.	2 00
766	Susan B. Anthony, Rochester, N. Y.	2 00
803	(for) Rev. Abner Kirk, Newcastle, Pa.	2 00
780	A Woodworth, Sandy Hill, N. Y.	2 00
773	Hiram Putnam, Syracuse, "	3 00
754	Mrs. Grace W. Drayton, Black Rock, N. Y.	4 00
801	Mrs. M. Bateman, Worcester Mass.	2 00
	DONATIONS.	$106 14
	George R. Russell, Jamaica Plains, Mass.	$30 00
	A. Woodworth, Sandy Hill, N. Y.	10 00
	Mass. A. S. Soc. (proceeds of Worcester Fair.	465 00
		$505 00
	Total	$611 14

Special Notices.

☞ THE PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY FAIR.—The Pennsylvania Anti-Slavery Fair will be opened, in Philadelphia, on Wednesday evening, the 6th of December, and will continue during the remainder of the week. The Committee of Arrangements trust that the efforts of their coadjutors and themselves will be successful in making the Fair unusually attractive and profitable. They earnestly invite the energetic co-operation of all the friends of the anti-slavery cause in Pennsylvania, and any of its friends elsewhere who may be disposed to aid them. Donations of money, or of any marketable commodities, will be thankfully received, and will be disposed of profitably to the cause. The produce of the farm, the garden, and the dairy, will always command sales at market prices; and gifts of money can be so invested in the Fair as to bring to our Treasury twice their original amount.

Those who intend to respond to our Circulars, by contributions of money or manufactured articles, are requested to send them to us as soon as may be convenient. Donations of Flour, Wheat, Vegetables, Poultry, Butter, Eggs, Lard, etc., etc., we shall be glad to receive at any time between this and the close of the Fair

Miscellaneous Department.

From Putnam's Magazine.

AMERICAN DESPOTISMS.

We remember, in crossing the British Channel once, that we had taken with us an odd number of *Punch*, to while away the tediousness of the passage. On landing at Boulogne, it was crammed into a side pocket, for safety, but the gendarme, who inspected travellers' luggage, seeing the paper, tore it into a thousand pieces before our face, looking as fierce as a pandoor all the time, and repeating, "*Il est defendu, monsieur!* it is forbidden!" It seems that *Punch* had been in the habit of drawing a small man with a big nose, which Louis Napoleon took for himself—this was before he and Victoria shook hands and kissed—and he avenged the indignity by excluding *Punch* from the republic. Subsequently, on entering Vienna, we had a *London Morning Chronicle* sequestered in the same manner because it contained some account of the progress of Kossuth in the United States; and a friend of ours, not long since, crossing the Po, from Austrian Italy into the Estates of the Church, had his Bible taken away, though copies of Voltaire's Candide, and Byron's Don Juan, were left untouched in his carpet-bag.

These were specimens of European despotism, and we thanked God that no such petty interferences with the rights of men were permitted in our own dear native land beyond the sea. A man, we said to ourselves proudly, may read what he pleases there, never saying, "by your leave," to any emperor, priest, or catch-poll of them all. The press is free, opinion is free, locomotion is free; and the wayfarer, though a stranger, may think his own thoughts, say his own say, and be happy, or miserable, as he likes, without let or molestation from his neighbours or the government. Hail Columbia! we exclaimed, in a fit of patriotic enthusiasm; home of the exile, asylum of the oppressed, refuge of the gagged and persecuted, etc., etc., etc. "Where the free spirit of mankind, at length, throws its last fetters off;" where a boundless field is open for every seed of truth to germinate; where an unlimited career is proffered to the excursions of the mind; where no tyrant, no creed, no church lays its heaviest interdict upon the growth of human thought! Hail, thou latest born of Time; mighty in thy youth; chainless and unchained; "gleaming in the blaze of sunrise when earth is wrapped in the blaze of sunrise when earth is wrapped in gloom." Oh, mayest thou long be proud and worthy of thy glorious power!

But calmer reflection taught us to inquire, after a time, whether our patriotism, taking the bit in its mouth, was not running away with our reason. Is it true that there is no despotism in America? Have we no authorities, which take the control of opinion, and assume to be infallible? Are there no institutions, no tribunals, no self-constituted judges, which impose injurious restraints upon the freedom of thought? Have we extinguished the spirit and habit of persecution along with its outward symbols, the rack, the stake, the dungeon, and the prison-house? We answered ourselves in this wise: We do not, it must be confessed, resort to the same compulsory methods against the human understandings, as obtained in former ages, and still obtains in some countries. We do not stretch the limbs of men on instruments of torture, because they refuse to conform to this or that standard in respect to the most incomprehensible dogmas—we do not pillory our poor De Foes, for the political crime of writing candidly on public affairs, nor imprison our humble Bunyans for proclaiming the gospel in the streets; we do not bury our statesmen under the sea as they do in Naples—we do not banish our most illustrious artists and poets, because they are liberals, to the wild swamps of Cayenne, as they do in France—all this must be confessed, and it must be confessed, too, that these are noble advantages to have achieved over the spirit of intolerance. We cannot too highly estimate their worth and glory. They are priceless victories won from the old empire of darkness and intolerance. They lift us into a security and elevation which baffles for ever the malice of a whole infernal brood of serpents, who may now hiss about the rock of our retreat, but cannot sting us to to death. Their fangs are extracted, and the poison-bags, with which their malignant heads are still sometimes swollen, serve only to inflict themselves when they distend with a disarmed and impotent rage.

Yet, if the advanced civilization of our age and country rejects the grosser applications of force by which opinion was wont to be controlled, there are others, it seems to us, which are not entirely discontinued. A less barbarous, a more refined tyranny is still compatible with the general sense of propriety and justice. There are chains which men forge for their fellows, which fret and cut their souls, if they do not canker their bodies. There are inquisitions of obloquy and hatred which succeed to the inquisitions of the faggot and flame. There is a moral coventry almost as humiliating and oppressive as the stern solitude of the dungeon. The spirit of bigotry may survive the destruction of its carnal weapons; despotism may retain its instincts, and give vigorous signs of vitality, long after the sword shall have been wrenched from its grasp; and the fires will burn in the eyes of bigotry when they have already ceased to burn upon its altars. For what is the essential and distinctive characteristic of despotism? Not its outward instruments—its Bastiles, its gibbets, its bayonets, its knouts, and its thumbscrews—but its animating purpose. It is the disposition to suppress the free formation and publication of opinion, by other means than those by which the mind is legally moved—by other influences than motives addressed to the understanding, the reason, and the better feelings of the heart. Wherever a man's bread is taken away because he votes with this party or that, wherever he is denounced to public odium because of the heterodoxy of his honest sentiments, wherever moral turpitude is imputed to him on account of his speculative errors, wherever he is in terror of the mob on any account—wherever the inveteracy of public prejudice compels him to remain silent altogether, or to live a life of perpetual hypocrisy, wherever his sincere conviction cannot be disclosed and promulged for fear of personal discomfiture and annoyance, wherever even a limit is fixed to the progress of research, there despotism flourishes, with more or less strength—and only needs the concurrence of circumstances to be nursed into museular violence and fury.

Now, as we have said, it seems to us that, tried by this test, we have despotisms in the United States, just as they have elsewhere, and, that with all our advances in liberality of which we justly boast, we come short in practice of the brilliant idol of our institutions. We have not attained to a genuine and universal liberty (we will not say *tolerance*, because that word is borrowed from an age when freedom was supposed to be a boon and not a right), and we fail not in one or two, but in many respects. In the Church, in the State, in the popular auditorium, and in the more private relations of society, we surround ourselves with needless barriers, we build walls of separation between ourselves and the great realms of intelligence yet unexplored, and we paralyze those intellectual energies which are our only instruments for exploring them, the only tools for working the golden mines of truth.

In the first place, we cannot but consider a large number of our ecclesiastical organizations as so many restraints upon the freedom of the mind. Founded upon creeds which admit of no possibility of truth beyond their own formulas, they discourage inquiry in the largest and most important domains of thought. We agree with Kant, the great German philosopher, who, in one of his valuable minor writings, discussing the question whether any association is justified in binding itself to certain immutable articles of faith, in order to exercise a perpetual and supreme guardianship over its members, and directly through them over the people, contends that a compact of this kind, entered into, not as a simple bond of union for the interchange of common sentiments, but with a view to conclude the human race from further enlightenment, is a crime against humanity, whose highest destination consists emphatically in intellectual progress. "A combination," says, he, "to obtain an unalterable religious system, which no man is permitted to call in doubt, would, even for the term of one man's life, be wholly intolerable. It would be, as it were, to blot out one generation in the progress of the human species towards a better condition; to render it barren and hence noxious to posterity." This conduct, in the religious world, proceeds upon the assumption that our knowledge of divine things cannot advance like our knowledge of natural things: that the first investigation of the Scriptures exhausted their contents, and that nothing is left for those that come after them, but, as Johnson says of the followers of Shakspeare, to new-name their characters and repeat their phrases. But does this view do justice to the sacred word? Granting that its leading principles may be easily discerned—a thing difficult to grant in the face of two hundred conflicting sects, each of which finds its support and nutriment in the same pages; for, as Sir William Hamilton is fond of quoting,

"This is the book where each his dogma seeks,
And this the book where each his dogma finds,"*

—we must still suppose, that a revelation from the Infinite will contain infinite resources of truth. Neither its alleged origin, which is from the perfect God, nor its alleged destiny, which is the final redemption of mankind from error, will allow us for a moment to treat it as an ordinary message, soon told and as speedily comprehended. It must conceal inexhaustible riches, or not be what it purports; while to suppose it to be what it purports, and yet to attempt to inclose its treasures in the frail and rickety caskets of words which men devise, is an enterprise for pouring the ocean into a quart-pot, or for bottling the air of the whole heavens in one private cellar. Nor is the attempt less pernicious than it is absurd; for it erects each little consistory into a separate popedom, issuing its infallible decrees and denouncing its interdicts with all the arrogance of its Roman prototype. As an inevitable consequence, two things result justly, that the supreme control of the religious sentiment of nations falls into the hands of the priesthood, who are conservative by position and training—and, secondly, that the energies of the churches are absorbed in controversy or sectarian propagation, at the expense of a free and earnest inquiry after new truth, and the culture of genial hopeful feelings. The history of our American sects, for instance, is an almost unbroken record of fierce and bigoted disputes. New England has been a kind of theological Golgotha, and the fields are covered with battered skulls. The clergy have been the ruling powers, too, not only there but everywhere; and the people have dared to laugh only with the consent of the deacons. We are aware that this aspect of things has materially changed of late years; we know, also, what inappreciable services the churches have otherwise rendered to society; but we must not forget, in the midst of our ready gratitude for these, how many of them by means of their creeds, and the terrors of their excommunications, as well as the power of their social influences—still hang as an incubus upon the minds and consciences of their adherents. Nor upon them alone, but many others—even those who do not professedly wear their colours. They too often terrify the ardent reformer, whose bright hopes they change by the magic of fear into dread spectres; they too often arrest the uplifted arm of science when it would strike from the rock or open out from the bowels of the earth some precious fountain of use; and they too often array themselves on the side of effete traditions and mouldy abuses, when they should be pressing forward under the ever-living inspirations of hope and freedom. It is said that Justinian, when he had completed the compilation of his Institutes, issued a decree that no comment should be written upon them, which aimed at more than a sketch of their contents or a transcription of their titles; well, the sects are apt to copy this imperial and arbitrary example—they impose on others, as exclusively right and authoritative, their own slender selections out of the vast complexity of truths, the few pearls they have fished out of the measureless sea, fancying that they have banished error, when they have only extinguished the independence of thought. Indeed, it is scarcely too much to say, appropriating the figure of Mirabeau, where he compares truth to the statue of Isis covered by many veils, that they teach their followers to lift a single one, when they fling their clubs and battle-axes at the heads of all who would remove the others. "*Procul, oh! procul, este Profani!*" rings the chorus, and the poor audacious "infidel"—as every dissentient is sure to be called—is handed over to an everlasting contempt. Now, what chance truth has in such a hubbub it is needless to say.

We recognise, secondly, an oppressive exercise of despotic power, in the conduct of political parties, both in respect to the violence, and bitterness of their hatreds, and the relentless proscriptions which crown their victories. The former is, perhaps, not to be avoided in the present imperfect state of enlightenment, and Christianity; but the second is wholly indefensible anywhere, and especially in a republican society. The primary, essential, distinctive right of man, in a free State, which rests upon popular choice, is the right of election, and to assail that right, by direct or indirect means, by force of arms, or the abstraction of one's subsistence, is treason against the fundamental principles of democracy—*lèse majesté* done to the people. Yet, every one of our political parties justify themselves in a wholesale political slaughter of their opponents, whenever they come into power. There are tribes in Africa, which sacrifice a hundred or two of men every time a new prince ascends the throne; but then they confine the immolation to the leaders only of their enemies; our Whigs and Democrats, less discriminating than the Africans, on the occasion of their advent to power, butcher all the opposing chiefs, and all the subordinate functionaries, down to the drill-sergeant or the sutler. Like William the Norman, when he conquered England, they distribute all the lands, and messuages of the vanquished, to their own set. A regular Domesday-book is opened, and the fiefs and holdings are parcelled out with a coolness of effrontery, which almost persuades us that the perpetrators of the outrage are unconscious of its monstrous meanness. It is an injustice which, however, works the usual effects of despotism. It degrades the character of all who are concerned in it; reducing political life into the sheerest scramble for spoils, and bring the suspicion of mercenariness upon every man who takes office. In either aspect, the practice is signally disastrous. By debasing the standard of official eligibility, it places in high position men of corrupting and pernicious example, and by relaxing the tone of public controversy, it saps and undermines the private integrity of the people. No service which government renders to society is more important than its influence in preserving a sense of the general good as superior to individual interests. Indeed, this may be regarded as one of its finest functions—the education of the masses, into a perception of the supremacy of the general over particular ends. Our natural impulses, our family ties, our necessities of business, tend perpetually towards the development of a selfish egotism, which our participation in public affairs tends as perpetually to counteract. But, if that participation, instead of being animated by a sense of devotion to the public good, is converted into an intense struggle for the accomplishment of individual purposes, we lose one of the most salutary restraints, one of the noblest inspirations of the civilized state. We resolve society into what Hobbs contended was its original condition—a state of war. We confirm the multitude in their narrow and low ambitions; and we restrict their actions to the petty circle of their own private and individual concerns. Again; the examples of really great statesmen are among the most precious and indestructible inheritance of a nation. No matter how great their services in averting dangers from the commonwealth, or in achieving advantages for it, by the direct exercise of their faculties, these cannot be compared with their indirect utility, in presenting to the people a high, manly, dignified and heroic ideal of devotion to the public weal. Their life-long abnegation of self; their cautious wisdom; their moderation of temper; the spectacle of their constant preference of a broad and ultimate good to local expedients and temporal triumphs, habituate the general mind to the contemplation of lofty ends, and models of excellence in conduct. Thus the characters of Washington, of Franklin, of Marshall, of Madison, etc., are infinitely more valuable to us Americans than the immediate effects of any battles they may have won in the field, or the forum, because they have filled our histories with pictures of a disinterested virtue. But are such characters possible in public life, when that life is no longer a contest of great minds for such ends but a pot-house squabble—when the despotism of party machinery excludes from public service every man who is not sufficiently base to stoop to its arts, and to roll in its ordure? Do we not, by our party intolerance, by the proscriptions which tread upon the heels of every success, rob the community of a twofold guaranty of its progress, of the services of its best men, and of a high moral tone of public sentiment?

But this leads us to the third species of despotism which we think it important to note, and which, instigated by the bad examples of both Church and State, may be described as that of popular opinion. We do not agree with those foreign writers who represent the tyranny of the majority in this country as absolutely terrific: they have exaggerated its effects; but their criticisms are not without a tincture of truth. Compared with the older nations, there is a larger freedom of opinion, on most subjects, in this country, than anywhere else on the globe—but, compared with our own standards, or the ideals of our institutions, we are on manifold subjects lamentably deficient. It is natural in a society whose stability depends as much upon opinion as upon law, and more upon opinion than force, that opinion, like other powers, should occasionally play the despot; but what we complain of is not the habitual watchfulness of the public mind over public interest, and the chronic tendency to rectify abuses or to avert evil by the instant insurrection of opinion, but the excessive resentment of that opinion when provoked. It is that unwillingness to be corrected which makes it rather a prejudice than an opinion—that tenacity with which it clings to its customary formulas—and the severity with which it resists even the slightest departures from them. We complain of it because it erects majority into an idol, a monarch, a tyrant, and begets a deference to it which is almost as bad as any savage superstition or local sycophancy. It weakens the very springs of character in men, and then lords it over their weakness with an irresponsible violence and outrage. Take, for instance, the pro-slavery sentiment of this country as it prevailed a few years ago—how arbitrary, ferocious and overwhelming! Not merely in the South, where the vast interests involved and the peace and security of society itself justify an extraordinary sensitiveness towards all impertinent interference, but throughout the nation, whence no such exigencies of danger can be alleged. In the most secluded districts of New England even, where a black slave was never seen, and thousands of miles away from where they are, the expression of anti-slavery views has been almost a courting of martyrdom. The feeling dominated the church, the senate, the popular assembly, and the private saloon. Let a preacher plead the cause of the negroes, and his salary was stopped; let a newspaper attempt the discussion of the subject, and it lost its subscribers; let a representative broach it in Congress, and he was gagged and excluded from the Committeee, or politely invited to fight a duel. Public meetings called to consider it were dispersed by the mob; petitions to the Federal Legislature against it were indignantly trampled under foot; the United States mails were feloniously invaded in its behalf—while the Agents of Anti-Slavery Societies were coated with tar and feathers, or mutilated, or hung upon a tree. It is true that all this has been since changed, but by means of what sufferings, what struggles, what strenuous and long-continued combats! Even at this time, the pro-slavery sentiment is so largely in the ascendant, that no man of the most moderate anti-slavery convictions can hold office under the Federal Government though that government represent, or ought to represent, not a faction or a locality, but the whole people.

De Tocqueville makes it an accusation against Democratic Societies, that they substitute a many-headed tyranny for that of a single man or of a single class, and the history of the anti-slavery controversy in this country, to our shame be it said, forces us to confess that, in this respect at least, his remarks are well grounded. "Fetters and heardsmen," he exclaims, "were the coarse instruments which tyranny formerly employed; but the civilization of our age has refined the arts of despotism, which seemed, however, to be sufficiently protected before; the excesses of monarchical power have devised a variety of physical means of oppression; the democratic republics of the present day have rendered it as entirely an affair of the mind, as that will which it is intended to coërce. Under the absolute sway of an individual despot, the body was attacked in order to subdue the soul; and the soul escaped the blows which were directed against it, and rose superior to the attempt; but such is not the course adopted by the tyranny in democratic republics; there the body is left free and the soul is enslaved. The sovereign can no longer say, "You shall think as I do on pain of death," but he says, "You are free to think differently from me and retain your life, your property, and all that you possess; but if such be your determination, you are henceforth an alien amongst your people; you may retain your civil rights, but they will be useless to you, for you will never be chosen by your fellow-citizens, if you solicit their suffrages; and they will affect to scorn you if you solicit their esteem. You will remain among men, but you will be deprived of the rights of mankind. Your fellow-citizens will shun you like an impure being; and those who are most persuaded of your innocence will abandon you too, lest they should be shunned in their turn. Go in peace! I have given you your life, but it is an existence incomparably worse than death." There are, however, two fallacies in this—first, in supposing that the social proscription alluded to could subsist without passing over into muscular violence, and, second, in the implication that the soul is less likely to rise superior to more than to physical persecutions. The experience of this country has proved the contrary of both. It has shown how the virulence of prejudice soon runs into lynchings and mob-law, whence its peculiar dangers; and it has shown, at the same time, by the reactions of the last few years, how effectively the most overbearing majorities may be resisted. Yet, as we have already acknowledged, there is a basis of truth in De Tocqueville's animated charges, as might be amply demonstrated from long, arrogant, insulting, and rancorous preponderance of the pro-slavery sentiment.

But, this sentiment has grown out of the existence of slavery itself, the last kind of despotism to which we shall allude. It is needless to remark upon its character as such, beyond the statement of the simple fact that four millions of human beings are held as property, a fact settling that point with an emphasis. From its very nature, it is a despotism of force, of law, and of opinion combined—partially mitigated in practice by humane personal considerations, but in theory absolute. It is administered, for the most part, by the whip; it is sanctioned by legislation; and it admits of no scrutiny or discussion. The master and the slave, therefore, are alike dominated by the system. All that can be said of it, in the regions where it prevails, even by those most deeply interested in its results, must be said in its favour, on pain of peremptory banishment or assassination. Indeed the illusions as to its benefits and the sensitiveness as to its dangers, are both so extreme, that many a slaveholder allows himself to read no book nor to hear any conversation in which his positive, unqualified, eternal right is disputed. What a pitiable and insane extravagance! And, if he were consistent, to what a total intellectual solitude would he be reduced, in the present state of the civilized world. He would cut himself off from all the literature, and science, and politics of mankind. He could read no magazine, foreign or domestic: the best works of genius would be closed to him; the investigations of science seem infectious; and the debates of Congress intolerable. In fact there would be no recourse for the class who institute this moral quarantine but to imitate the habits of the chigo, as it is described by Sydney Smith, where he says that each one sets up its separate ulcer, and has its own private portion of pus. One would suppose that under the tremendous responsibilities of its condition, and the embarrassing perplexity of the problem it is called to solve, it would welcome every honest suggestion likely to throw light upon the case, and even court that collision of opinion out of which the truth is gradually struck. But it does no such thing: it repels every approach as an insolence and an invasion of its rights: and blindly surrenders itself to the darkness of fate. It is fortunate that all slaveholders are not of the same temper, that there are men among them too liberal and intelligent to fall into such unreasonable bigotry, who, on the contrary, study with an intense solicitude the bearings of their social structure, and eagerly seize upon every view of it which may afford them hope for the future. It is to them that we look for the wise management of their fearful trusts, and the eventual extinction of what they must confess to be a most undesirable relation. They are as yet sadly overborne by the pressure of opinions instigated by interest, but will soon acquire a strength which will place the control of events in their hands.

Now, in respect to the several forms of despotism which we have briefly enumerated, we shall not dwell upon their radical inconsistency with the life and spirit of our entire polity; for this consideration is too obvious to require pressing. Nor is there any occasion, now, to show the inherent weakness of any cause, or position, which shrinks from the fullest and fairest examination. But we cannot forbear remarking upon the deep and abiding injury which every man, who is unwilling to bring his actions or his sentiments to the test of scrutiny, does to himself, and the rest of mankind. He shuts himself and society out from the only means of correcting error and attaining knowledge. We know of no method of arriving at the true relations of a subject, but the frank and candid discussion of it in every aspect. The time is past for believing in the existence of any infallible authority, whether pope or king, whose decrees are to be considered the final arbitrament of truth. There is no class or rank of men to whom we may look for a fixed and irrevocable standard of what it is right to think or proper to do. Our individual judgments are contracted, uncertain, warped by prejudices; and the more profoundly we have penetrated into the complex problems of life which solicit solution, the more familiar we become with the vast extent and variety of human error, the more distrustful we grow of the authenticity and correctness of our decisions. Yet, in the midst of the almost overwhelming multiplicity of crude and preposterous speculations, in the wild chaos of conflicting beliefs which storm around us, we do discover that the general mind is slowly eliminating one truth after another; the immense laboratory of seething and fermenting thought is ever turning up some valuable and brilliant product; and keen research and grappling argument secure us substantial conquests from the realms of ancient Night. Discussion—free, open, manly, patient discussion is the key which opens the treasure-chambers of nature and revelation, and the deep human soul. Like the cradles of the Californians, it sifts the golden metal from the common filth and dust. Summoning every variety of intellectual instruments to its aid, contemplating things in all their aspects, exposing falsehood, detecting fraud, baffling selfishness, overwhelming ignorance, and rectifying hallucination, it opens the way for the slow but majestic and beneficent march of the human intellect towards the mastery of the world.

No sensible man will now dispute the gigantic advances which the civilized races have made in the various departments of mathematical and physical science, since they were committed to the hands of free inquirers, nor wish to revert to those political institutions and religious scruples by which their progress was so long fettered. But it would be no less absurd to despair of the speedy success of the moral and political sciences, once emancipated from the despotisms by which they are checked. The very triumphs of the former sciences are a ground of hope for the rapid and extensive improvement of the latter, when these shall have adopted the methods, and be prosecuted in the spirit of those. "The practice of rejecting mere gratuitous hypotheses," says the able author of "The Letters of an Egyptian Kafir," "of demanding facts, of requiring every step of reasoning to be clearly exhibited, of looking with perfect precision to the use of terms, of discarding rhetorical illusions, and mere phrases, of scouting pretensions to infallibility, or exemption from rigorous scrutiny, are all required as indispensable in physical research, but cannot possibly be confined to the department of material philosophy. They will necessarily be extended to moral inquiries; and, supposing that, in consequence of social proscription, or priestly or political tyranny, these latter subjects were totally abandoned, received no direct examination, were exposed to no discussion for even a long period, were withheld (if we can conceive it possible) from the very thoughts of men, for half a century, yet the influence of physical investigation upon them could not, in the end, be prevented. All the correct principles of reasoning, all the improved methods of research, all the habits of comparison and discrimination, all the love of truth, which the pursuit of any science has a tendency to establish or engender, all the impatience of vagueness, and obscurity, and assumption, which the prosecution of inquiry superinduces in the spirit of men, would gather round the prohibited subjects, ready, like hungry lions, to rush on what they had been withheld from, by the bars, and chains, and bolts of social or political despotism." With the frequent admonitions of that paragraph, which we commend to all in the United States, who wish to obstruct the advances of opinion, on any subject, we dismiss our theme.

Before quitting it entirely, however, let us add that we have been drawn to it by criticisms that we have seen, from time to time, passed upon the conduct of this magazine. A feeling of surprise has sometimes been expressed that we should mingle with our lighter entertainments, grave and thoughtful considerations of the leading political, social, scientific and religious topics of the day. But, surely they who express that feeling can neither have studied our course from the beginning, nor have thoroughly digested in their own minds the proper aims and duties of a first-class periodical. It was never our intention to issue a monthly exclusively for the milliners; we had no ambition to institute a monopoly manufacture of love-tales and sing-song verses; and, if we had, we should have despaired of success amid the brilliant successes already achieved in that line. No! we had other conceptions of the variety, the importance, the dignity, and the destiny of literature. Our thought, in establishing this enterprise, was, and it still is, that literature is the full and free expression of the nation's mind, not in *belles-lettres* alone, nor in art alone, nor in science alone, but in all these, combined with politics and religion. It seemed to us, that the cultivated men, the literary men of a nation, are among its best instructors, and that they feebly discharge their function, if they are not free to utter their wisest thoughts, their most beautiful inspirations, on every subject which concerns the interests, the sensibilities, and the hopes of our humanity. Whether they pour forth their sense of beauty, grace and gentleness in strains of poetry, or enlarge our knowledge of man in sketches of travel, or bring nearer to us the countless charms of our landscapes by natural descriptions, or help us to a clearer conception of great characters in biographic notices, or lift the disposition into cheerfulness and buoyancy by outgushings of humour, or refine our views of life and happiness by ideal portraitures, or snub pretension, and arrogance, and folly, by caustic satire, or unfold the magnificent vistas of science, or canvass the movements of parties and the measures of government in the light of great general principles, they still belong to that higher priesthood, whose ministrations emancipate us from the care and littleness of daily life, who enkindle in us the love of the loveliest things, who reveal the depths of our spirits, and "whose voices come down from the kingdom of God." But in order to the true manifestation of this exalted character, a free scope must be given to the action of their genius; and such we trust they will ever find in the pages of this Monthly.

Figaro said that he once conceived the project of setting up a journal, and that when he applied to the government for the necessary permit, they accepted his scheme with the warmest applause. "It will be a capital, excellent thing," said they; "and provided you never touch upon religion, nor politics, nor private society, nor the affairs of the opera, and submit each article to the decision of three censors, it shall receive our heartiest concurrence!"

Whereupon, adds Figaro, "finding that the best name for it would be *Le Journal Inutile*, I concluded to drop the enterprise." As for ourselves, we have no desire to publish a "useless journal," and if we cannot "say our say" of what is passing, or, if we must cultivate the wonderful art by which politicians talk for a month without saying anything, we shall imitate the discretion of Figaro, and hasten to other fields, and leave journalism for those who either have no opinions of their own, or have the amiability to say one thing while they think another.

The Fortifier of Sebastopol.—Every one has heard of Sebastopol, but every one has not heard of Colonel Upton, for many years the chief engineer of that redoubtable fortification. Mr. Upton was the surveyor of the Dunchurch and Stratford road, and resided at Daventry for many years. His name frequently apperas in the Parliamentary reports of the commissioners of the Holyhead road, between the years 1818 and 1826. All the greatest improvements on the above line were made under his superintendence; and Mr. Telford, who was the engineer, of the Holyhead road, had the highest opinion of his acquirements, and took every opportunity of stating his opinion of him to the commissioners. Mr. Upton got into a course of expensive living unwarranted by his means, and was induced to commit many gross frauds on the trustees of the road. These frauds were discovered in the month of April, 1826, and, on inquiry by a competent person employed, it was discovered that he had trespassed on the funds of the trustees to an amount exceeding £2,000. Evidence was taken at the time of the facts, and he was held to bail to appear at the July assizes following to answer the charges. He appeared at the assizes, and answered when called upon to plead. The trial did not come on the first day of the assize. He had been given to understand by his solicitor that he would be merely indicted for a fraud, but he obtained information he could not doubt that he would be indicted for forgery, and, if found guilty, would probably be hanged. He slept at Northampton, got up about seven o'clock, said he was going to take a walk, and should return to breakfast. He did not, however, appear again, and, as it seemed, went that morning to London. By some means he got a recommendation to the Russian authorities in London, received the appointment of engineer, and was, in a few days, on his way to the Crimea. We have heard by what means he obtained his recommendation, but if we were to publish them they would implicate persons whose characters are unimpeached. As talents are much more highly prized in Russia than honesty, it is possible that his real character might have been given. Talents are the first thing required in that country, and the surest guarantee for honesty is the certainty of being hanged if you are detected in being otherwise. When Mr. Upton went to Sebastopol the harbour was in a very inefficient state, and in vain had several engineers endeavoured to improve it. There was great difficulty in getting the water into it so as to admit large ships. He procured immense iron works at Birmingham, and by dint of science, labour, and expence, he made it what it is. The whole time of his residence in the Crimea he has been engaged in the fortification in the Black Sea, and has been for some years the chief engineer at Sabastopol. The Emperor was so pleased with him that he gave him the rank of lieutenant colonel in the army, and he was received at the palace at St. Petersburgh. In addition to his numerous forgeries and frauds, he got upwards of £3,000 of the money of his wife's relations, not one farthing of which did he repay. He held the post-office at Daventry for a year, and at the end of it was a defaulter of nearly £300, which one of his sureties was obliged to pay. He died about a year ago, and has left a name more durable than the brass artillery he planted at Sebastopol.—*Northampton (England) Herald.*

For the National Anti-Slavery Standard.

THE FUGITIVE SLAVE.

Where the palm trees wave slowly their pennons of gold,
In a shaded verandah; two forms there behold:
He kneels by her side, with an aspect all grave;
She an angel of beauty, and he a black slave.
'Tis not that the maiden reclined at his side
Is a proud lady's hope, and a proud nabob's pride;
'Tis not that a legion of objects her will
In humblest submission are trained to fulfil;
Not for these, with untiring, assiduous care,
Doth he guard this sweet flowret, with fragrance so rare;
To the *goodness*, enthroned on her beauteous brow,
The tried, faithful servant his spirit doth bow.
How proudly he looked on that sweet loving face,
As the deep azure eyes so carefully trace,
With the reverence deep of her delicate age,
The glowing words, writ on the bright holy page;
How gladly remembered his kindliest care,
When dimmed was the lustre of this jewel rare,
Which but for *his* tenderest cherishing, then,
Had never revived to fresh beauty again.
The poor bondman's curse was almost unfelt
For that innocent's love by whom he then knelt,
Her kind bearer, he, from her infancy proved,
And the delicate child, now more gratefully loved,
With the blest Holy Book, opened wide on her knee,
She read of the "Spirit that maketh all free."
A strange light gleamed forth from the bondman's dark eyes,
Which bright little Eulah observed with surprise.
A moment, she pondered—"Can *Slavery* be?
Where the truth of the Crucified maketh all free?"
In the breast of the slave a fierce struggle began,
'Twixt love for the child and himself a "Free Man,"
In that moment of anguish, a purpose he planned,
And Eulah that purpose instinctively scanned.
But the angel within her spoke to her true heart,
"Kind Eulah, Oh, let the poor bondman depart;
He fleeth for Freedom, Oh bring him not back,
But hasten the fugitive swift on his track!"
She laid in his bosom her small purse of gold,
While her eyes' dewy language her confidence told,
And her prayer went mounting up to the storehouse above,
Brought hope to his breast on the wing of its love.
Yet scarce could he trust that the angels in heaven
To the bondman accursed had their sympathies given;
But for sweet Eulah's love, he felt they would guide
His lifeboat to Freedom across the dark tide.
Ye children of Penn, he cometh to you,
To the light that hath guided him on, oh! be true;
The beacon which led him all bruised to this spot
Is the torchlight of liberty. Oh! quench it not.
The black waves of agony over him roll:
Give hope to the fainting, speak peace to his soul:
Oh, *here* let his cry for compassion be *heard*,
Where Liberty's voice was *first* uttered in *word*.
Speed, Oh, speed the fugitive on, with a shout!
And let the "Old Bell" from iron steeple ring out—
He fleeth for Freedom, Oh! bring him not back,
But hasten the fugitive swift on his track!
Ye sons of the North, he fleeth to you;
To the watchwords which speedeth him on, Oh! be true;
For the boon which he seeks, *ye* would peril your life;
He is earning it in a more terrible strife:
For thy strongest bonds that his loving heart span,
He is breaking them now for this high "Right of Man."
That ye fought for it bravely, and earned it full well,
Your Green Mountain Banners unceasingly tell;
Then cheer on the fugitive, wounded and faint,
Nor let him in weal for sweet liberty pant;
Let woman her mission of goodness fulfil,
And sympathy's dew on his hot brow distill;
Let her wipe, with soft hand, the fresh blood from his feet,
And, speeding him forward, her blessing repeat;
Cry aloud till your vallies are filled with the sound,
And from every green hill let the echo rebound—
He fleeth for Freedom, Oh, bring him not back,
But hasten the fugitive swift on his track!

THE GENUINE DOUGHFACE.

The Genuine Doughface was not always a Doughface. Six years ago, he was prominent at Abolition meetings, and wrote rampant little paragraphs for the *Daily Tocsin of Immediate Emancipation*. That was before he discovered that it was David Wilmot, not Jefferson, who wrote the Ordinance of 1787. Slander (which never spares the good and great) says that he even belonged, in those days, to the Encouragement-of-Slaves-to-Cut-their-Masters-Throats Society. But it is not worth while to try to recall the circumstance to his memory. You misunderstand his meaning. He has written a Letter, to a friend (at the South), since then, in which that fact is clearly shown.

At present he is known to himself, though not to the community at large, by the name of a Conservative and Patriot. He loves our glorious Union. He venerates the American Eagle. If he has an enthusiasm, it is for the Star-Spangled Banner. And he says so on all occasions. He is fond of quoting from Webster's Speech against South Carolina Secession, where it talks about "the broken fragments of a once glorious Union, dissevered, discordant and drenched, it may be, with fraternal blood!" which, he says, was intended as a warning to posterity not to elect anti-Nebraska members of Congress.

He dislikes slavery. He considers it a moral and political evil. Not above his breath though, at Washington, but very loudly at home. But he thinks that by weakening the South, it gives the North great commercial advantage, and political preponderances. He wonders that "our folks" will not see in that light, and act for their own best interests. When he visits his Southern friends, who live in Charleston, he remarks feelingly on the aggressions of the North upon the Constitutional Rights of the South, and its rashness in provoking sectional disputes. He admires the Southern character. So hospitable, courteous and chivalrous. And the much misrepresented condition of the blacks. Well fed and clothed, and taken care of in their old age. What more do they want? He doubts whether separations often occur in families. He would like to have been born in Virginia. His Southern friends, who live in Charleston, consider him a remarkably enlightened and liberal-minded man.

The Genuine Doughface never alludes to the sad accident which deprived him of the use of his backbone. It is conjectured to have occurred at Washington, where he was once a member, or at Baltimore, where he has been several times a delegate.

If we remark that he became, three years ago, the owner of sixteen shares of Texas scrip, that he is an applicant for a place in the Custom-House, or that Mrs. G. Doughface, previous to her marriage, inherited a fine plantation—stocked—from her lamented uncle in Alabama—we refer to these facts as things apart, and not to be understood as bearing at all upon his political opinions. For his disgust of mercenary politicians is well known. His indignation at that money-making scheme entitled the Kansas Emigrant Aid Association is a case in point. He was the first to point out its sordid objects.

He is a lover of Peace, and Law, and Order. He considers the mob attack on the kidnappers in Wisconsin a shameful outrage. He is not a lawyer, but his opinion is that such offences come under the head of high treason in the first degree. He is confident he has seen a decision, somewhere, to that effect, by Judge Story. The authorities are justified in any amount of force—yes, bloodshed—to put them down. He is surprised you should think there is any similarity in the case of Obadiah Snooks, the schoolmaster. Snooks, to be sure, was *said* to have been lynched and tarred and featherd, in Georgia, for receiving an Anti-Slavery letter through the Post-Office. But where was the evidence of it? Newspapers always exaggerate. Besides, what business had he to set himself up in opposition to the well-known prejudices of the community?

He has a keen eye for danger to the Union. He declares it will fly into a thousand flinders if Bungtown Centre elects a Free Soil constable. He shakes his head when you say Disunion has died out. Its designs are concealed, he admits—but they are so much the more dangerous. His vigilance is as untiring as that of the old lady who used to march at night up and down the sidewalk in front of the City Bank, to guard it from robbers—after the careless Directors had all gone to bed.

He holds that all this agitation about slavery is an "ism." It is only temporary. They make a great hullabaloo about Nebraska and all that, but it will blow over, and that will be the end of it. To be sure, he made the same prediction in '48, and again in '50, and again in '52. But there have been unforeseen circumstances since. When it is over this time, there will never be any more. Then demagogues and fanatics will be kept at home, as they ought to be, and men of real talent and ability put in office.

He doubts whether any of these fellows that make so much noise about their sympathy with the slave would give the first dollar to buy one's freedom. He would, of course. He gave five to remunerate Mr. Lemmon for the loss of his, and boldly had it published, with his name in full, in the *Journal of Commerce*. It was published twice. He is not afraid to let his right hand know what his left one is about.

He would like to know how we came to be so much wiser than our forefathers? Why didn't they mention niggers in the Declaration of Independence if they meant to include 'em? He is confident that the Fugitive Slave law would have received their approval: in fact, he is inclined to think that the original draft of it was made by Jay and Hamilton. To be sure, they did away with slavery in this State, but he doubts whether they would have adopted that rash measure if they had foreseen the use people would make of it. And if Washington did emancipate his slaves, it was when he was on his death-bed, and probably after his mind began to wander.

He is fond of broadcloth and our best society. He thinks there are distinctions, even in a Republic, which we are too apt to lose sight of. In this respect, he thinks we have degenerated—except at the South. They are not so much mixed up there as here. All history shows that, in well-ordered countries, there are certain classes to do the work, and certain others to—to—take care of them, and attend to the Government. He is not unfrequently a member of the Church, and was one of the committee to congratulate the Rev. Mr. Humdrummle, on his Thanksgiving-for-the-Compromise Sermon. He takes a lively interest in missions—that is, distant ones. He belongs to the Society for propagating the Gospel among the Feejee Islanders. At present, however, he is threatening to leave the congregation, on account of the Rev. Humdrummle's discourse in favour of the introduction of the Bible among the Virginia slaves. For, as he observes, what business has the pulpit to meddle with politics? He prefers to go to some place where they preach general Christianity. Religion is too vast a subject to be narrowed down to particular localities and individuals.

He does not care for office. Although he has once or twice, out of personal regard for the President, consented to accept a post in one of the Departments, he has repeatedly refused to allow his name to be used in his district as a candidate for Congress—once